Ivan Dzyuba

FACETS OF A CRYSTAL

IVAN DZYUBA

FACETS OF A CRYSTAL

UKRAINA SOCIETY
KIEV, 1976

One might compare Soviet multinational culture with a sparkling solid crystal in whose numberless gleaming facets are secreted boundless wonderworlds.

Soviet Ukrainian culture is one of these facets.

The fraternity of socialist national cultures forming a single whole — Soviet culture — has been in existence and continuously developed for more than half a century. How do these cultures interact? What processes go on in each of them; what changes occur in the nature of their unification in the course of time? Is there any contradiction between their versatility and unity, between the tendency to promote national elements and that of rapprochement and affinity? Finally, does the involvement of each national culture in such a homogeneous union result in actual "benefits"? If so, what are they in regard to a particular — in this case Ukrainian — nation?

These and other questions are dealt with by Ivan Dzyuba in his *Facets of a Crystal.*

Ivan Mikhailovich DZYUBA
FACETS OF A CRYSTAL

Translated from the Ukrainian by **George Sklyar**

Copyread and edited by **GLADYS EVANS**
Editor of the Ukrainian original text: *L. Bruy*
Cover design by *V. Berezoviy*
Makeup by *V. Ostapenko*

Both the author and the publishers will appreciate any comments from readers which will be welcome at:
THE UKRAINA SOCIETY, 6 Zoloti Vorota St., Kiev-34, Ukrainian SSR.

Published by the UKRAINA Society, 6 Zoloti Vorota St., Kiev-34, Ukr. SSR

Printed at the RADYANSKA UKRAINA Print Shop, Kiev. Order No.699
Price: 18 k.

National culture is the pride of every people, it is their precious historical treasure and heritage which is handed down from generation to generation. It is, as our prominent literary critic O. I. Biletsky put it, people's "patent of birthright" which distinguishes them from other nations, a testimony to their spiritual individuality and worth. At the same time, national cultures serve the good of all mankind: they unite peoples rather than separate them, through their common democratic trends, through their ideals of truth, humaneness, social justice and humanism. National cultures (bearing in mind their democratic and socially progressive contents) link people by bridges of mutual understanding, friendliness, reciprocal benefits and rapprochement.

The solidifying function of their national cultures, which cannot be a dividing factor, stands out most distinctly and is especially useful in analysis when the point in question is the historical rapprochement of certain peoples.

The Ukrainian people are the blood relatives of the Russians, Byelorussians and other Slavic peoples. Their whole national culture, even in the times of tsarist oppression, developed through direct and fruitful mutual contacts with these fraternal cultures, with the cultures of other Slavic peoples and nationalities inhabiting the Caucasus, Transcarpathia, South-West Asia and the Baltic Republics. In this sense, the impact of the great Russian culture was especially tangible and inspiring.

"The Muscovite people created a spiritual, literary and scientific life," wrote Ivan Franko, "which also flows incessantly, through thousands of streams, into the Uk-

raine and into our minds." Hence, as a result of centuries spent as neighbors and of living together in one state, the historically formed circumstance of a mutual exchange of contacts and influences of the cultures of many nationalities acquired, after the Great October Socialist Revolution and the downfall of tsarist autocracy, an essentially new quality: the relations of these nationalities grew gradually into an accord, into a unity of cultures of socialist peoples.

Modern Ukrainian national culture is part and parcel of Soviet culture as a whole. Unless considered as an integral part, it is impossible to evaluate its role correctly, impossible to properly understand the processes developing within Ukrainian culture. Therefore, however we approach the matter, we would inevitably arrive at the homogenous whole of which our national culture is a part.

The socialist culture of the peoples within the USSR, this great single whole or integer has been developing and maturing for more than half a century. Having two specific aspects, this culture emerges as an entirely new phenomenon, unprecedented in the history of mankind.

In the first place, it represents a unity of diversities. Multinational, infinitely varied in its national forms, it has been and continues to be united in its proletarian class character and socialist content, united in its internationalist spirit and purpose.

Secondly, it is a culture of the working people, of the broadest workers' masses. It reflects their life, their ideology, their interests, serving to benefit their social and spiritual development. Its ultimate goal is to make the working man's life happier, more interesting and upright, thus facilitating the construction of a society of social justice — communism. Having started out on this essentially new pathway in history, it has already gained tremendous achievements by becoming not only a colossal moving force in creating a new reality in our country — the USSR, but also a ponderable factor in the world's ideological and spiritual life.

The advancement and achievements reached by Soviet socialist culture are the sum total of the joint working together of its various parts — the national socialist cultures of the Soviet peoples, including Ukrainian national culture.

This brochure points out the place Ukrainian socialist culture holds within Soviet culture, some of its most significant attainments, the ways and means of its interaction with other national cultures within a supreme, complete whole — the single socialist culture of the Soviet people.

It is certainly impossible to cover such a comprehensive subject in a brochure of this size, the more so that the topic has more than once been dealt with by other authors in the form of either scientific papers or publicistic writings. Still, I should like to share some of my meditations. Besides, there is yet another reason which made me undertake this theme.

There was a time in the past when I entertained profoundly erroneous, fallacious ideas with regard to certain aspects of the aforementioned subject—namely, the condition of Ukrainian national culture and literature, as well as the national question in general. A number of my misleading public appearances along these lines were subsequently made use of by the hostile bourgeois nationalistic propaganda abroad to expedite its ideological campaign against our country.

Upon realizing the baselessness and falsehood of my outlook which had made me an involuntary accomplice of the Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists in certain respects, I made a definite rebuttal of my views in a statement published by the *Literaturna Ukraina* (Literary Ukraine) newspaper on November 9, 1973. But I still feel obliged to return to this subject in order to enlarge my knowledge of the factual situation and better understand it from the Marxist-Leninist standpoint. I also consider myself beholden to partake in refuting false concepts and exposing various kinds of stratagems to which our ideological foes resort, endeavoring to distort the understanding of Ukrainian culture. Simultaneously, I am determined to help popularize the latter's achievements and spread knowledge about our culture among people.

This is the main objective of my present publication.

Ukrainian Culture and Its Ill-Wishers

The socialist culture of the working people, the Soviet people, has, from its very inception and all through the following decades, been subjected to "criticism" and "objections." It has been and continues to be exposed to furious attacks on the part of the enemies of the proletariat — bourgeois ideologists of all types, ranks and shades.

Over the last few years, these attacks have noticeably grown in strength and have become even more treacherous. This is to be explained, first and foremost, by a general sharpening of the ideological struggle under conditions of the peace drive carried on by the forces of socialism. Another reason is that bourgeois propaganda finds it increasingly difficult to deny the successes and achievements reached by our society in social and economic development that are obvious to one and all. So this propaganda seeks revenge and recoupment in a more subtle sphere — culture.

Since not only the "position of strength" policy, but also attempts at undisguised ideological pervasion continuously and hopelessly break down, they now try to use "cultural infiltration" and "spiritual enticements" through cultural channels, placing special emphasis on plans of stimulating an "internal evolution" of socialist society along the guidelines desired by our ill-wishers.

Due to the breakdown of the above-mentioned policies, the Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists abroad are forced to gradually abandon their old propagandistic "pillboxes" and "bunkers" which are now remote from the lines of confrontation, and look for more "convenient" fire emplacements. They also find it increasingly difficult to shed tears over the "hardships" and "impoverishment" allegedly inflicted on tens of millions of Soviet Ukrainians.

Instead, with a gnashing of teeth, they have to acknowledge the high industrial and agricultural levels in Soviet Ukraine, the continual growth of national prosperity.

So they pounce with still greater malice and obstinacy on other aspects of our life. In part, they seem to have concentrated their fire on questions pertaining to Ukrainian national culture. Day and night bitter tears are shed in the voluntarily formed nationalistic ghettos on both sides of the ocean over this culture's "tragic lot," while the streams of abuse and curses hurled at us are far more often wrapped up in thick layers of feigned "commiserations," "good advice," etc.

Listening to these maudlin voices of fratricides, so hastily requalified, one would think these people's hearts ached over one thing only: that Ukrainian culture should live on and flourish, that it become the Ukrainian nation's spiritual passport. Today, they allege, this Ukrainian national culture is in a deep decline, if it is not already under threat of general extinction.

On what grounds do they come to such a baffling "conclusion"? Perhaps on the basis of objective, thoroughgoing analysis of the modern level of Ukrainian culture, of its progress, traditions, aims, problems, potential capabilities and actual complexities?

Nothing of the sort! That would at least call for a slight bit of real knowledge and comprehension of our socialist way of life, of our socialist spiritual heritage which is exactly what the callused and hardened souls of the bourgeois nationalists are innately "unreceptive" to! That is why their nihilistic evaluation and their denial of modern Ukrainian national culture lack any kind of constructive sense and historical reason whatever. Such an attitude is owing to sheer blind prejudice, or the obstinate rejection of Ukrainian culture as it really exists, the culture of the millions of working masses.

This national culture "does not satisfy" the bourgeois nationalists, since it serves the cause of communism, the cause of internationally uniting the working people of various nations, since it is born of the reality of our multinational country. They would prefer something totally different, the opposite: they would like to have a nationalist-elite culture which would be far from the people and their essential interests, a culture permeated

with bourgeois ideals and ideology and aimed against socialism and fraternal nations — especially against the Russians. Proceeding from the stand they take — which is anti-Ukrainian and anti-patriotic (notwithstanding all their allegations) in its historical quintessence taken at depth, they are trying to present modern Ukrainian culture in a distorted light.

Bourgeois nationalist propaganda chews away incessantly at the thesis of the "inequality" of Ukrainian culture, literature and the arts, at the fact, so they allege, that the Communist Party's national policy is directed toward... squeezing all three gradually out of the people's way of life. In maintaining this allegation, they are careful to ignore or hush up all that is being done in our society to render ideological and creative support to popularizing Ukrainian culture and the arts, to making them truly massive, providing for them materially, organizationally, professionally, and ensuring that they have adequate personnel, as well as production and technological means.

Distorting the spirit and the letter of the Communist Party's policies in the sphere of national culture, bourgeois nationalist propaganda is "sweating" especially over the falsification of questions concerning the correlation of Ukrainian and Russian cultures, concerning the nature and mechanism of their interaction in the spiritual life of the Ukrainian population, concerning the relationships between national cultures of the peoples inhabiting the Soviet Union. Soviet reality is thus approached from the standpoints of national cultural relationships that were either inherent to pre-Soviet times * or are practiced in modern bourgeois societies.

Our ideological ill-wishers pay no heed to the new, socialist character of Soviet national cultures. They are reluctant to see that a single international culture of the Soviet people has emerged and matured into a historical reality, and that it is concretely implemented in the diversity of socialist national cultures. Anyway, who would expect from them even the slightest friendly or interested attitude to, or understanding of, the immensity of the social and cultural processes under way in our country?

---

* i.e., prior to the October 1917 Socialist Revolution — **Ed.**

Culture and the National Question

The Ukrainian socialist nation has been developing as a component of a multinational Soviet society. Their national culture is accordingly also part of the multinational culture of this society. A multinational society, just like a multinational state, is nothing new in history. Throughout the many long centuries of mankind's development, mankind has in different historical epochs been accompanied by the most diversified forms of coexistence among different tribal and lingual groups, as well as by attempts to unite various nations and races within a single state. These endeavors, however, never led to the creation of a qualitatively new historical community of man that differed from existing ethnical or national communities where a society of exploitation of man was neither more nor less than the social prerequisites born of necessity. All these new formations failed to withstand the test of time and sooner of later dissolved because they lacked internal social ties, that inner awareness of the necessity of such unity. Such communities did not emerge as a result of irreversible social and economic processes, but took shape following conquests, or a transient combination of political or economic events, and they were patched together by means of oppression or ended up by living an exclusively formal, superficial existence. What was more, they were split within by internal contradictions, national hostilities and mutual insults concerning the habits of their respective nationalities — social and class antagonisms are the unavoidable products of national antagonisms.

This was, in fact, only natural: national groups and peoples cannot truly fraternize while there is no genuine

fraternity or trust among the people within every single national group or nation, and until a society is built up based on social justice — i. e., socialism.

The revolutionaries and proletarians of various countries have always joined forces and continue to do so, just as the reactionary forces and capitalists of various nations found a common language and still do; but these represent the uniting of classes rather than national unity, and are the logical results of the class struggle which goes on within individual societies, as well as all over the world. There never could be any peace, harmony, equality and justice — either internationally or within individual nations — where social inequality, discord, and the exploitation of man by man ruled supreme.

We see the very same thing in the present-day capitalist world, even after its colonial system has been liquidated: there are incessant international squabbles, political, economic and trade rivalry; ethnic and linguistic conflicts (the latter are currently going full blast in such "exemplary" countries of bourgeois democracy and civilization as Canada, France, Great Britain, Belgium, you name it), also national "inferiority" and "superiority" complexes, the exploitation — both economic and spiritual—of weaker nations by those who are stronger, cultural expansion, the "piping off" or enticing away of scientists (the brain drain), etc., from other countries, and, more often than not, tragic clashes due to national animosities with their victims, blood and tears....

It is not without reason that various kinds of pseudo-scientific theories that mystify the national question, that proclaim the inevitability of international hostilities and of the exploitation of one nation by another, and that see in the struggle of nations for supremacy a basic "law" of history, if not the moving force of progress — have become so popular with bourgeois ideologists in the capitalist world.

According to these "theories," the egotism and mutual prejudice of nations, their "incompatibility," animosities and estrangement, which are irrational and ineradicable by nature, are non-social and non-historical traits because they stem from the uttermost impenetrable depths, from some kind of immutable and mystic "spirit" ("spirits") of nations.

Therefore, no social or historical pedagogics, or any social reconstructions whatsoever, could presumably do any good in such a case.

Such theorizings are all designed to justify the ineptness of bourgeois society to solve the national question, or to achieve international solidarity, peace and concord.

Marxism-Leninism deals with the matter in a totally different manner. It proceeds from the fact that national animosities, mistrust and rivalry are by no means properties inherent to man, but are born of a class-antagonistic society which spreads its principles of man's exploitation and oppression even in the sphere of international relations.

Under the conditions of such a society, national equality and accord, progress and friendship are certainly out of the question.

With the downfall of such a society, however, and the liquidation of class antagonisms and the exploitation of man by man, the social reasons for nationalism and chauvinism are eliminated. Then the social ground and adequate living conditions are prepared to bring about a new type of relations between the peoples — those based on peace, close contacts, cooperation, friendship and mutual cultural enrichment, so the peoples can gradually and voluntarily draw closer together and continue their all-round and harmonious development.

The historical experience of our socialist society and more than half a century of practice in national construction and national relations within the Soviet Union have proved the validity of such Marxist-Leninist ideas.

It is worth recollecting at this point that the young Land of Soviets received the worst possible and most intricate national heritage from prerevolutionary tsarist Russia. The latter was an imperialist power. Non-Russian peoples inhabiting it were oppressed by tsarist autocracy both socially and nationally (as regards social oppression, the Great Russian people — workers and peasants — suffered as much as all other nations).

The natural wealth, economic resources and cultural potentials of the oppressed nations were subject to ruthless exploitation. The oppressed nations had neither statehood, nor self-administration (Poland and Finland being the only

exceptions, granted certain formal "privileges"). This situation condemned them to economic and cultural backwardness, illiteracy and poverty. These nations were deprived of even formal equality. "Outlanders" they were called, which meant that they were not considered to be one hundred percent citizens of Russia — with all its dire consequences.

The tsarist policy was directed at suppressing national cultures and languages. Thus, the Ukrainian language was proclaimed nonexistent, just as the Ukrainian nation was also so regarded. The ultimate goal of the tsarist national policy was Russification, a "fusing" of all other peoples with the "ruling nation." In order to weaken the resistance of the oppressed, strengthen its power over them and over its own nation, and to prevent joint action on the part of Russians and other peoples in a struggle for social liberation, the tsarist authorities used every opportunity to fan the flames of national passions, squabbles and animosities, and to promote great-power chauvinistic ideology. It is not hard to understand that the fearsome national problems of prerevolutionary Russia were rooted in its social structure, in class supremacy, in the power of the landlords and bourgeoisie.

Just try to visualize this burdensome historical heritage, this tight, almost hopelessly tight knot of national contradictions and wrongs! No other society but a socialist one could have coped with it and could have found a constructive way out of the deadlock. At all events, we are witnesses that bourgeois societies find themselves helpless to straighten out much simpler "synonymous" situations where the jigsaw puzzle consists of fewer pieces.

The fact remains that Marxism-Leninism knew the historical "secret" of the national question, and where the root of national inequality was to be found: in the exploiting system and the exploitation of man by man. Which meant that it also knew where to look for the key that would solve the problem: in the liquidation of class antagonism, the collapse of an exploitative society and in revolutionary advancement until a class-free society was built. That was why socialism proved capable of not only cleaning out the Augean stables of the historically inherited national question, but also capable of asserting entirely new principles of national coexistence

in the life of the multimillion and multilingual masses. It has created, for the first time in the history of mankind, a multinational state and a prospering society in which the interests and advancement of dozens of peoples are met and harmoniously combined. All these peoples joined their efforts and have achieved tremendous successes in the development of their economy, science, technology, public education and culture.

The 50-year-long experience of our multinational country has shown THAT the national question is of a historical nature and has nothing to do with the mystic or biological reasons; THAT mankind is by no means doomed to wallow in its narrow, blood-weltering labyrinths; THAT neither national inequality, animosities, the oppression and exploitation of one nation by another, various social and psychological national complexes, nor the brand of "objectionable" national background, etc., are at all "inherent" to a human community, but are only the fruits of certain historical stages in its development, fruits intrinsic to that same class-antagonistic society caused by class inequality and the exploitation of man by man.

True, sometimes this connection is not so easy to trace. It may be indirect and not clearly apparent at first. One might even have to look for it in the complexity of social relationships, but it is always there.

"We have successfully dealt with the national question in those particular aspects in which it came to us as a heritage of the prerevolutionary past," said General Secretary of the CC of the CPSU Leonid Brezhnev in his well-known report on the Fiftieth Anniversary of the USSR. "However, national relations, even in a mature socialist society, are a continuously developing reality which presents new problems and tasks."

He went on to state: "One cannot forget that nationalist prejudices or any manifestations of exaggerated or perverse national feelings are a rather vital phenomenon which takes a firm grip on the psychology of people who are not mature enough from a political standpoint. These prejudices continue to survive even under conditions when the objective prerequisites for any antagonisms among peoples have ceased to exist... Neither do we have the right to forget that politicos and propagandists of the bourgeois world do everything to kindle the flames of

these nationalistic prejudices from without. And whenever they do appear our class enemies pounce on them with high enthusiasm, blowing on the fires and feeding them, hoping to weaken, to some degree at least, the unity of the peoples in our country."

Our mode of life, the relationships among the nations within our country are free from national unrest, squabbles, antagonism, conflicts, national discrimination and privileges — which we cannot even recollect as having ever existed. All kinds of national prejudices and "national evaluations" that set people against each other have long ceased to exist. Our people, whatever their nationality, are granted equal opportunities in all walks of life. Every single Soviet nation has been provided with the best possible conditions for its social and cultural advancement. Our way of life — the very character of the relations between our nations — seem to us so very natural and matter-of-fact that often some of us never even give a thought to how much it has cost us to fight for all these benefits and, finally, to establish them as a set social course, forgetting that it was not always like that, that it could not have become so overnight, and that it is not like that all over the world nowadays, let alone before.

I wish they would give a thought to it and would try to imagine what national discord and animosities are like, and how much people once suffered over them, how many lives were wasted, and what tears and blood were shed in the past because of national inequality and conflicts. These were not only historical conflicts between nations; they were the countless national hatreds in social and everyday life which shook multinational societies. The historical development of man, his humanization, his social and cultural progress were all hindered to a great extent by this national disunion.

I wish they would remind themselves of how many people all over the world — in Northern Ireland, Rhodesia, Cyprus, Singapore, in the United States with its problem of the Black population, and in the Middle East — are suffering today because of national animosities.

This would probably help even the "skeptics" to realize that national peace, serenity, accord, good will and truly brotherly friendship represent a great achievement and are of great benefit, to realize the deep sense of national

compatibility and plurality which have taken very firm roots in our life during Soviet times. So firmly rooted, in fact, that the above-mentioned achievements seem to have been with us for ages as part of our everyday life.

Another thing: would any one of us even imagine that a man could regard his national background as some kind of shameful brand, as an obstacle to making plans for the future, to reaching his goals or sticking to his ideals? And would anyone's national origin ever prevent him from receiving an education, getting a job, revealing his abilities in any spheres of human endeavor, or from expressing his talent and receiving the recognition due him from society? Does my being a Ukrainian, a Georgian, a Kazakh or Yakut — and not a Russian — have the slightest effect upon my social and living opportunities, my destiny, my road in life? Does it change the social, political, public or ethical status of my personality?

A Soviet citizen would be more than surprised at such questions. However, these, and other questions of a similar kind, would be quite in the nature of things and unavoidable as regards any other, say bourgeois, society, in which they would be more or less typical (even modern works of fiction and art of the West cannot dispense with using the conflicts these problems give rise to).

Wouldn't this alone suffice to make one visualize and comprehend the essential differences between the national situation and national relations under socialism and those in bourgeois societies? And this is only one feature, one aspect of our national reality.

Let us now try to visualize the picture as a whole, not only with regard to the individual lives and destinies of peoples of different nationalities, but also the historical destinies of whole nations, the historical life of many peoples, some of whom only during Soviet times have developed their own written language and literature and professional culture, have advanced their economies to become modern nations; while others have liquidated for good their economic, cultural and educational backwardness, as well as disparity to emerge as nations which are the equals of any highly developed counterparts in national economy, science, engineering, education and culture. They are all making progress at a uniform pace and scale following a

single plan, drawing upon common sources, sharing their achievements and benefits justly and fairly, guiding their historical development with a common aim in mind — an aim simultaneously directed at national internal improvement of every republic. Let us try to visualize all this against the vast background of history and compare it with those forms of national coexistence mankind knew in the past. Let us compare what we have now to the former national rivalry, egotism and antagonism, which still rule today in the bourgeois world, and form its law of existence. If we do so, we will see that what has been achieved in our socialist society in resolving the national question is of worldwide and historic importance.

It is common knowledge that progressive humanity has highly praised, and still is, the Soviet Union for its successes in solving this problem, for the social and cultural development of its nations, for ensuring national accord, harmony and friendship among its peoples. It is also common knowledge that national-political and national-cultural leaders and movements throughout the world — especially those in multinational and multitribal Asian and African states — have studied and continue to carefully study the first socialist country's experience in developing national statehood, national cultures, languages and sciences.

The experience accumulated by the Soviet Union has thus been universally recognized as being of history-making world significance — not only in the sense of overcoming the burdensome heritage of the past and finding means to achieve national equality, but also in the sense of constructively developing nations up to the level of socialism, outlining ways into, and prospects for, definitely translating into life socialist internationalization.

A prominent figure in the international communist movement and the U.S. Communist Party leader for many years, William Z. Foster, rendered an expressive summary of the Soviet Union's achievements in the sphere of relations among its constituent nations when he wrote in his *The Twilight of World Capitalism* that national chauvinism, the attempts of one national group to domineer over the others under the pretext of its alleged superiority form one of the worst negative effects of capitalism. Socialism solves this acute problem. Under socialism, people of

all nationalities and races live in a complete accord which is based on the absence of any prejudices and discrimination whatsoever. Under socialism, no citizen encounters those hardships and obstacles in life that are met by millions of citizens in bourgeois countries who suffer humiliation and persecution only because they are Black or Jewish, or belong to some other national groups which the ruling class finds it necessary to doubly persecute and exploit. Such national prejudices are subject to criminal punishment in the USSR. Friendship and accord among the numerous nationalities forming the Soviet people are one of the Soviet Union's greatest achievements. The Soviet system unites nations within a single socialist regime, which at the same time offers them every opportunity of preserving their national customs and national culture. Such accord among nationalities has been reached by granting people complete equality, irrespective of their color, beliefs or national origin. The harmonious relationships among all the national groups within the USSR prophecy the future elimination of national hatred, jealousy and rivalry, those plagues of humanity that exist under capitalism, provided socialism becomes established all over the world.

Friendship and Mutual Assistance Among USSR Nations As Practical Manifestation of Socialist Internationalism

The human race has always felt the desire to become united. This aspiration is as old and strong as the individual's (and the nation's) basic need to assert itself.

Man's painful awareness of estrangement and his thirst to embrace all humanity have all been expressed in the spiritual world of mankind, in the distinguished works of art, in literature, and in the philosophic meditations of all peoples. One might say that both the apperception and the idea of a united humanity run ahead of the social realization of a union of mankind (exactly like, say, the idea of a just society).

Without a broad social confirmation, however, the ideal of a union of mankind remained something utopian, illusory and a distorted picture, or it might even become its direct opposite.

Until but recently, the problem of uniting humanity was "solved" in historical practice either through attempts at world conquest or the forming of dynastic "holy" empires, or by "peaceful" ways—through the hegemony of one nation over another, or by others uniting around one (hence the ideas of diverse kinds of great racial and religious communities: Pan-Turkish, Pan-Arabic, Pan-Slavic powers etc.), or with the help of world religions — such as Buddhism, Christianity, Islam, or esle by following the cosmopolite path. In other words, all represented a distorted form or a usurpation of the idea of a union of mankind, rather than its realization through man's historical develop-

ment. The human race was advancing toward a future world communion sustaining great losses, getting off course and suffering from self-delusions.

The appearance of the *Communist Manifesto* gave thorough-going social and scientific corroboration to the teachings of Marx and Engels on proletarian internationalism which became the comprehensive and purposeful class cause of the proletariat. The ideas of proletarian internationalism corresponded with a new stage in the history of mankind — the development of economic relations and economic life on a world scale, the creation of a world market, the all-round mutual dependence of nations under capitalism. Finally, and the most important of all, they corresponded with the emergence and maturity of the working class whose specific situation called for their uniting internationally, as a prerequisite for their ultimate victory.

Proletarian internationalism made it possible to understand, from the standpoints of history and dialectics, the real processes of internationalization, processes that are inevitable under capitalism; and to understand as well the perspectives for such internationalization under socialism. It pointed out that the proletariat would stand at the head of these processes, and that the proletariat would control them in their class interests which would be at the same time the most vital interests of man in general, that is, of the laboring and democratic strata of all peoples, nations and nationalities. This doctrine was the first scientific approach to the concrete and mutual dynamics of those processes, testifying to the fact that the proletariat, with the aim of making all aspects of man's way of life international, would not need to "nullify" nations, or to denationalize them, nor would it have to single out any one nation as a special implement for this internationalization and entrust it with such a historical mission.

According to the scientific tenets of Marxism, proletarian internationalization is to be carried out, first and foremost, by uniting the proletariat of all the various nations in their class struggle with the bourgeoisie, their own and those of all the world. Later, this was continued by overcoming the dialectical contradictions between the national interests and between the aspects of various national ways of life by means of impartial, economic and social factors

of inter-nation exchanges to achieve rapprochement and merging of nations.

It was only in the proletarian era that a sufficiently strong social support appeared that might lead to a future worldwide union of man, a support strong enough to carry on a practical massive political struggle for such a union. The term "union of man" is not to be interpreted as a unification — it would simply be internationalism: a class and political fraternity of the working people of all nations whose joint efforts would build up a community of social justice throughout the world.

For more than a hundred years the bourgeois class have been trying without success to prove that proletarian internationalism is aimed against national interests, against national independence, and national sovereignty. In reality, however, the working class under capitalistic conditions is the staunchest fighter for the free and democratic development of all nations. Such a free national development of all peoples is one of the indispensable prerequisites of proletarian internationalism.

The notion of proletarian internationalism was especially broadened and deepened as a result of the all-embracing practical endeavors and theoretical works of Vladimir Lenin and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

Vladimir Lenin and the Bolshevik Party had to work under conditions that involved a multinational Russia, rallying the working people of many different nations, and later establishing Soviet power to build socialism in a country whose population was composed of dozens of nations and nationalities who were on widely differing levels of social development.

In carrying out such historic activities they were naturally faced with an infinitive variety of problems arising from national policies. To solve them correctly demanded a thorough-going theoretical elaboration of the fundamental principles of proletarian internationalism. It is not without reason, therefore, that national relations and proletarian internationalism form one of the significant components in the Leninist heritage.

Socialist construction in our country and the friendship among the Soviet peoples would have been impossible if the Communist Party had not made, as the foundation of its national policy, the speediest possible economic and

cultural development of all nations, and the gradual liquidation of the inequality that factually existed among them, and which was not to be eliminated by declarations of purely formal equal rights, which bourgeois democracy confines itself to, in regard to these same national rights.

Considering the vast scope of the national and ethnic composition of onetime tsarist Russia, the large gap existing between its industrialized central European part and the Asian and Siberian regions, as well as the burdensome moral and political heritage left behind by trarist autocracy in the sphere of national relations, one can well imagine the complex and severe difficulties that this great task involved. Its accomplishment made manifest the whole productive might of proletarian internationalism which the CPSU was guided by, and it called forth from the working class of higher developed nations — above all by the Russian working class — great sacrifices and unselfish aid to their weaker revolutionary counterparts.

Tranks to the aid rendered, the rate at which the economies in a number of the republics advanced was many times higher than the average rate throughout the union (which was also known to have been very high), which fact enables all the Soviet peoples to expand and further develop their economy.

The USSR republics have made exceptional progress in their national economies during Soviet times. Compared with 1922 (the year of the Soviet Union's formation), for example, the overall industrial output has increased 176 times in the Ukrainian SSR, 239 times in the Uzbek SSR, 343 times in the Byelorussian SSR, 513 times in the Tajik SSR, 527 times in the Armenian SSR, 532 times in the Moldavian SSR, and more than 600 times in the Kazakh SSR.

Special emphasis was placed on the training of national cadres, which also yielded unprecedented success.

Bulding up modern industries and ramified systems of socialist agriculture and institutions of learning in the once backward republics, and the fraternal aid of workers, engineers and scientists from the country's large industrial centers — resulted in a quick increase in the number of qualified national personnel involved in all branches of the national economy and culture.

In the republics of Middle Asia and Kazakhstan, for

instance, the number of metallurgists has risen 18 times throughout 1926 to 1959, that of chemists 72, mechanics 39, tractor, truck and harvest-combine drivers 628 times. These indices were considerably higher than the country's average. They testify to the general rise of economic, technological and cultural levels, also to the growing number of cadres in the national republics, and to the growing cultural and technological standards of the multinational working class, farmers and Soviet intelligentsia.

The once backward peoples made immense progress in the spheres of culture, public education and research-personnel training. For instance, higher education standards of the Middle Asian republics advanced far beyond many Western European and American countries. As regards the number of higher and vocational training school students per 10,000 population, the Uzbek SSR outmatched the USA, Great Britain and France. Whereas under tsarism quite a few nations of the Russian Empire (Uzbeks, Kazakhs, Tajiks, Turkmenians, etc.) did not have their own specialists with a higher education, nowadays the USSR has specialists that include all Soviet nationalities. The statistics of 1968 give 89,000 Uzbeks, 63,000 Kazakhs, 17,000 Kirghiz, 19,000 Tajiks, and 17,000 Turkmenians.

The postwar* five-year national economic development plans promoted an especially impetuous growth. In 1950, for example, there were 739 Kazakhs, 845 Uzbeks, and 1,932 Azerbaijanians among the country's research personnel. In 1971 the picture changed as follows: 8,629 Kazakhs, 12,928 Uzbeks, and 13,998 Azerbaijanians (as regards Ukrainians, the figures were 14,692 and 107,475, respectively). According to the 1970 all-Union census, the dynamics in the number of population with a higher or secondary (complete and imcomplete) education per 1,000 employees, registered in 1939 and in 1970, were: 108 and 653 throughout the USSR; 109 and 656 in the Russian Federation (the RSFSR); 120 and 668 in the Ukrainian SSR; 55 and 663 in the Uzbek SSR; 83 and 654 in the Kazakh SSR; 46 and 643 in the Kirghiz SSR; 40 and 602 in the Tajik SSR; 113 and 674 in the Azerbaijanian SSR.

As a result of the aforementioned successes by once

* i.e., following the 1941-1945 Great Patriotic War — Ed.

backward nations and following the impetuous advancement of the formerly outlying regions, the national economic and cultural levels of various republics evened up to a considerable extent, and the character of their mutual relations changed in spheres of economy, personnel training, scientific and technological progress, etc. Whereas exchanges of experience in many economic and cultural branches previously meant unilateral assistance from developed nations to backward ones, the gap between the levels of all nations and nationalities was now being gradually filled in due to the increase of national industrialization; and one-sided aid was replaced by reciprocal national assistance and cooperation.

This reciprocal support and cooperation became manifested with special clarity in all spheres of life during the postwar years.

Behind the facts and figures provided above lie the tremendous, Communist-Party-led work of all Soviet people, the fundamental transformations effecting the entire way of life of once backward nations, in the prospects and destinies of millions of working people. Such is socialist humanism in action. Certainly, to understand all this, one has to abide by criteria reflecting the vital needs of many millions of people, and not by subjectivistic and nationalistic criteria; one has also to understand the vital wants of the working people, to supply them, take heed of them, and not indulge in arbitrary nationalist claims and daydreams...

Both nationalist politicos and nationalist Philistines hate any talk about the real internationalism of the Ukrainian socialist nation, its internationalist obligations within the family of Soviet peoples. The economic, social and cultural cooperation among the republics and the mutual assistance of the peoples in the USSR are proclaimed by them as being a kind of camouflage behind which Ukrainian wealth is piped off and Ukrainian incomes are spent for purposes other than their own.

This playing upon low and proprietory instincts, upon crude egotism, could possibly work on primitive kulak psychology, but never on the psychology of Soviet man, on that of a Soviet Ukrainian internationalist.

The Ukrainian internationalist, brought up by the Communist Party, is well aware of, and remembers the

tremendous assistance rendered the Ukrainian people by all the fraternal nations in the years of the Civil War and in rehabilitating their war-devastated national economy, in constructing the gigantic projects of the first five-year plans (such industrial giants as the Zaporizhstal, Kharkiv's tractor-manufacturing and Kramatorsk's machine-building plants, and the Dneproges were built with the joint efforts of all the Soviet peoples), in liberating Ukraine from the Nazi invaders, and in restoring it anew from the devastating ruins of war. The Ukrainian internationalist understands that the labor, intellect and talent of all peoples inhabiting the USSR — and not only those of the Ukrainians — have contributed to the present-day high scientific, technological and cultural level of Soviet Ukraine, just as the Ukrainians have added their share to the accomplishments of all the other Soviet peoples. He can see that the Ukrainian SSR's aid to the other republics is not unilateral, that it does not result, for example, in the Ukrainian nation's having to part with its wealth for the good of others and by so doing to live in worse conditions than the rest (as is alleged by those taking an oblique approach toward our life and whose imagination is fed by the experience of the bourgeois world). On the contrary, Ukraine's living standards are, in fact, among the highest in the Soviet Union.

Hence, such all-round economic cooperation and mutual assistance serve to benefit the Ukrainian people.

"The working people in our counry have long become convinced that the successes achieved by each republic, every region and almost every enterprise — are the result of the fraternal cooperation among all the nations within the USSR. All the Soviet republics, for example, take part in developing Lviv Region's industry. Motors for buses, chassis for lift trucks and ball bearings for motorbikes are delivered to Lviv from Moscow; turbines, various motors and measuring instruments from Leningrad; automobiles from Yaroslavl; section steel from Volgograd; electric motors from Tallinn and Kaunas; equipment for light industry from Alma-Ata, Frunze, Yerevan and Minsk. The production of Lviv's enterprises — buses, truck-mounted cranes, lift trucks, agricultural machinery, lathes, instruments and light industry goods — is supplied to all the Union republics.

"The Ukrainian SSR's national economy is inseparably linked with that of the entire country, is part and parcel of it. Coal extracted in the Donbas is delivered to the RSFSR, Byelorussia, Moldavia, Georgia, Armenia, Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia. Ukraine's rich open-hearth furnace iron ore and dolomites are supplied to all industrial enterprises in the European part of the RSFSR, as well as to the Georgian, Azerbaijanian, Kazakh, Byelorussian, Lithuanian, and Latvian republics. Simultaneously, a large quantity of non-ferrous rolled stock, most oil products, timber, etc. — are shipped into Ukraine in order to satisfy her industrial needs. Socialist emulation drive, involving workers at enterprises in the fraternal Soviet republics, provides for solving complex technological problems." *(History of the Working Class of the Ukrainian SSR* /in Ukrainian/, Kiev, 1967, vol. 11, p. 418.)

Soviet People— a New Historical Community

The formation of a new historical community of man — the Soviet people — was a natural and inevitable outcome of the continuous development and interaction of the many socialist nations and nationalities within the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The notion "Soviet people" (introduced by Vladimir Lenin as he used the expression "Soviet man" for the first time in 1919) has long been in existence, and has been used through the entire history of our multinational socialist society. It has been inseparable from the internationalist self-consciousness of the citizens of our country. The intrinsic meaning of this notion, however, has undergone historical alterations: it has been broadened and deepened in line with the actual historical progress of our multinational society, and effected by the broadening and deepening of mutual contacts among our socialist nations through the changing character of their interaction. Speaking of the first revolutionary years, the Civil War, and the start of socialist transformations within a multinational country whose nations differed in the levels of economic development, it appears that this notion did not encompass certain elements of society (as, for example, the Nepmen* and kulaks), nor yet all sides of public life. It only reflected the ideological and political singleness of the proletarians and all the rest of the working masses and the revolutionary forces of all nations in the country, those who rallied round the Communist Party in their struggle for common ideals, for a new life, for their socialist state. It reflected their awareness of this socialist

* i.e., NEP+man (NEP=New Economic Policy)— **Ed.**

state being built as their common Homeland, the homeland of the working people of all nationalities. Following the construction of the foundation of socialism in the USSR, this notion was further broadened and deepened through the awareness of the homogeneity of once diversified Soviet nations, of their equality, legally and factually, also of their active, comprehensive and continuously growing mutual assistance. Finally, upon reaching the stage of developed socialist society and of broad-scale communist construction, the notion of "Soviet people" took on a qualitatively new meaning which expressed the high level of all-round interaction among socialist nations, expressed their social, ideological, political and spiritual singleness, making it possible for the Communist Party to arrive at the conclusion that a new historical community of man had been formed.

It should be emphasized that Soviet sociological theory distinguishes, in principle, this new historical community from all previously known in history, stressing, in part, the fact that it is not an ETHNIC community — in other words, that it is not to replace nations.

This platform is stated in documents of the Party and in speeches made by Communist Party leaders. Addressing the audience in Alma-Ata on the occasion of presenting the Friendship of Nations Order to the Kazakh SSR, General Secretary of the CC of the CPSU Leonid Brezhnev made this point clear:

"Speaking about the new historical community of man, we by no means imply that national distinctions have already disappeared in our country, nor that a fusing of nations has set in. All nations and nationalities inhabiting the Soviet Union preserve their peculiarities, the features of their national character, languages and their best traditions. They have every opportunity of achieving an even richer flourishing of their national cultures."

"Soviet people" should be interpreted as an historically original, social and class, international integration of members of a developed socialist society which came into being as the result of social unity in all major spheres of activity.

In the social and class sphere this means the liquidation of exploiting classes and social antagonisms, the creation of a homogeneous social structure of all nations

and nationalities, the union between the multinational working class and peasantry in all the republics.

In the social and economic sphere, it means the socialist ownership of the means of production and a socialist system of national economy which takes into account the national economy of each and every republic, creating a single, essentially internationalist, national economic complex.

In the ideological and political sphere, this means sharing a common unity as to goals, tasks and interests in communist construction, being united by Marxist-Leninist ideology which has become the ideology of all classes, social groups, nations and nationalities in the Soviet Union, united by Soviet patriotism and the principles of socialist internationalism.

In the cultural and educational sphere, this means Soviet culture, forming a unity that is socialist in content and national in form; this means the mutual enrichment and rapprochement of national cultures so that this collective efforts build up a common international culture within Soviet society; this means unity within the country-wide educational system, promoting a general increase of literacy throughout the population; this means overall unity in scientific and technological development.

In the moral and psychological sphere, this means a common Moral Code of the builders of communism; means socialist humanism; collectivism; devotion to communist ideals, to labor, political and public activity; means respect for people of all nations and races; intolerance of racial and national prejudices; means solidarity and mutual assistance, to mention but a few aspects.

As we see, the sociopolitical category implied by "Soviet people" is not an abstract notion, nor is it the fruit of free theorizing. It is permeated with deep, versatile and vital content since it specifies a most substantial historic reality, the reality of a highly organized multinational socialist society. In the course of its long development lasting over half a century, and seeking to perfect itself, this society has advanced very far along the road of reciprocal permeation and large-scale cooperation by all the socialist nations that are part of its formation.

In the process of their development the Soviet people have concentrated steadily on building up their socialist

national strength, materially and spiritually. It is as if they are growing in stature, becoming more versatile, more sensitive and responsive to the special features, gains, interests and needs of every nation. They are adopting a greater degree of solidarity as they further perceive the broader range of valuable contributions they absorb from the heritage of every single nation, especially the cultural heritage, so that all cultures are raised to an all-Union level. As a result, all cultures form a single gem of many facets, each having an ever richer spectrum of national life — this is also incorporated in the general concept "Soviet people." Cultures are not dissolved, but rather assert themselves in this general concept.

Being part of the Soviet people, the nations themselves draw new strength from this single gem. The amount of vitality and future of the nation lies in its irresistible advance, in the broadening of its horizons, in its being willingly receptive to other, fraternal nations, and to all mankind, in its invariably constant unity and intelligent receptiveness to things alien. The life of the Ukrainian socialist nation is linked by countless strings to the way of life of many other socialist nations, and vice versa. Due to the deep-going interaction of the economic, cultural and spiritual potentials within and without and among the nations, each one may drink from the common font immeasurably multiplying its strength and capabilities, stepping up its development and, at the same time, finding new ways of using its own reserves and making them available to other nations. This permits the entire family of socialist nations — the Soviet people — to make the most effective use of their combined efforts, finances and other means, economically that is, as well as rationally directing them toward a harmonious or all-round development of society in general. Without taking all this into account, or giving it thought, it is quite impossible to correctly estimate the possibilities and prospects of the Ukrainian socialist nation in regard to all spheres of social life, culture included.

Dialectics of the Flourishing and Rapprochement of Nations and National Culture

This new historical community, the multinational Soviet people, has not emerged as the result of a blind or spontaneous process. It involved a prolonged and objectively vital development, supported and guided by the Communist Party. Proceeding from the principles of proletarian internationalism, from the Marxist-Leninist teaching and from the relevant political guidelines laid down by Vladimir Lenin, the Party developed far-reaching and well thought out activities in the sphere of national relations which would make a sufficient impact on, and alter such relations in favor of the proletariat, and for the cause of socialism. Under socialism, this general trend in the development of national relations has been defined in the classic Party formula: the prosperity and rapprochement of the socialist nations. Or, in other words, rapprochement through their prosperity, and prosperity through their rapprochement.

The ill-wishers of socialism and socialist internationalism see in this formula an insolvable discrepance: that allegedly the one excludes the other. Some of them also maintain that it is an intentionally formulated sophism. As for the most "farsighted" nationalists, they "try to trap" communists in their claims regarding the rapprochement of nations, alleging that in reality communists aim at the merging of nations — in other words, denationalization.

Indeed, communists do not conceal their conviction that the merging of nations will objectively follow their rapprochement. They, however, regard and understand all these processes — their flourishing, rapprochement and merging — in their dialectical race unity. From the stand-

point of Marxist-Leninist theory, these notions have an altogether different meaning from the preposterous allegations feigned and attached to them by bourgeois and bourgeois-nationalist propaganda.

Marxism-Leninism conceives the merging of nations not in the ethnic, but in the social and political sense — that is, not as denationalization, but the attainment of total unity between the working people of the different nations. At first, it will be an ideological and political unity, the unity of class action. This unity will gradually extend to all spheres of social life, at which point it will merge into a single unity.

Vladimir Lenin was known to have more than once emphasized the fact that being international does not mean a lack of nationality, and that, in particular, "international culture is not non-national."

This specific dialectic regarding the national and the international, regarding the blossoming of nations and their merging is exactly the same as we see in the processes taking place in the sphere of national relations in our modern society. We shall most certainly find the creative application of the Leninist understanding of the national question in the known provisos of Party documents and in the science of sociology concerning the "united duality" of national development in the USSR: i. e., the flourishing of nations and their further rapprochement, while their flourishing "acts upon" their rapprochement and their rapprochement upon their flourishing. And this is not at all a sophistic phrase intended to conceal something, but a formula reflecting the dialectics of life itself.

Indeed, this closer drawing together does not imply a mechanical assimilation, but an inner affinity and mutual enrichment, a creative receptivity of learning; it means broadening the sphere of the sharing in common of the material and spiritual resourses of different peoples which leads to an increase in the sources of material potentials and spiritual experience available to every single nation. It represents a material and spiritual enrichment of peoples that provides every nation with new opportunities for all-round development. The drawing together of nations, therefore, promotes their prosperity and forms one of its most abundant sources.

In addition, the more a socialist nation develops in conjunction with other fraternal socialist nations, the broader are its horizons, the more diversified its requirements and the richer its interests, and the less satisfied it becomes with only its own, individual way of life so that it strives to draw upon those sources which are akin to its own. The general historical law asserting that the higher the development, the greater is the demand for contacts, for utilizing the gains of other cultures, is manifested here with particular clarity. Finally, the development of a nation not only indicates the maturing of its specific national elements, but also those national components which are common and close to other nations. It is a development of everything generally humane within the nation. These aspects of the flourishing of nations thus facilitate their rapprochement.

This dialectic in regard to the flourishing (or development) of nations and their rapprochement is easily traced in the sphere of culture, the arts and literature. The intensive communication between national cultures results in profound reciprocal effects as concerns enriching the content and form of each national culture; this stimulates their inner potentialities, and is apparently full of turbulent development. Simultaneously, this development leads to appropriating the gains of every single national culture by all the others, but mainly to the deepening of inner ideological and aesthetical homogeneity of cultures, to the strengthening within them of common elements of international socialist culture. Ukrainian national culture in the past, for instance, never experienced such spiritual, ideological and artistic closeness to Russian culture, or to the culture of other socialist nations, as it does today. But, at the same time — and we shall return to this further on — it has lost none of its national uniqueness. On the contrary, it has enriched, developed and improved it.

In vain has bourgeois propaganda distorted the meaning of such notions as the rapprochement and merging of nations, raising a clamor about denationalization. If one looks into the facts, he will see that over the years of Soviet rule and socialist construction not a single nation, nor a single national culture, has disappeared, nor are any of them in jeopardy of disappearing. All these nations have grown stronger, richer and prosperous.

Neither do national languages disappear. Most persons belonging to a particular nation still adhere to and study their mother tongue, though the populations of national republics also learn the Russian language as a means of communication among nations, which fact plays a very important part in the life of our society, and in the spiritual enrichment of all our nations.

Here is the conclusion arrived at by specialists who have studied the matter:

"During Soviet times, national languages have undergone impetuous development. This process is still going on and will continue to do so in the future, because the facts corroborate that in our times the majority of the inhabitants of our country speak their native tongue. Therefore, the national language remains the basic means of communication among the peoples of our country. But alongside the development of national languages, another process is taking place — that of narrowing the sphere of local dialects, as well as strengthening the role of Russian as an international language of communication." (*The International and the National in a Socialist Society,* Kiev, 1973, p. 151 — published in Ukrainian.)

Language is one of the basic indicators that distinguish a nation. For man, it is an important historical, social and cultural treasure, linked as it is with the innermost foundations of his national and spiritual individuality. On the other hand, it becomes part of the most general social, sociopolitical and state problems, at times reflecting them with utmost eloquence and emotionality. It is common knowledge that many international collisions and conflicts — often resulting in bloodshed and deadlocks — have occurred, and still do — on linguistic grounds. The question of languages is universally recognized as one of the most complicated and troublesome of issues.

Plenty of contradictory ideas have been expressed by prominent thinkers throughout the ages on how to overcome the linguistic barriers dividing mankind, but man has made little progress in making this long-cherished dream come true. Considerable difficulties along these lines are to be found in the objective divergence between the need for worldwide communion and the inherency of the national tongue to a particular nation, as well as in the essential significance of the mother tongue to national life

and its spiritual integrity as a treasure house of the historical, cultural and life experience handed down through successive generations within the nation.

The question of languages has always formed a tangled problem of national and political ambitions. But this is not the only point in question. It also concerns the fact that national languages are objectively natural, necessary, expedient and diversified, in a multinational world. They are objectively necessary to make the picture of the world complete.

Today, these languages and their future prospects are to be viewed not only from the communicative standpoint, but also from that of their being treasures of a national spiritual and historical heritage. Any one-sided approach would therefore be irrelevant. The successes reached by a multinational socialist society are an especially important experience in this sense. Our society sees the simultaneous development of national languages and a language for international communicating as the only correct and effective way out of the problem. The functions of an international language for communication are exercised in our society by Russian. This is also an important aspect in the dialectics of the development and rapprochement of the socialist nations within the Soviet Union.

Socialist in Content, National in Form, International in Spirit and Character

The formula of Soviet culture as socialist in content and national in form has long put down firm roots in the Marxist-Leninist theory of culture, in Soviet sociology, and in our everyday social and cultural life. This formula has existed for more than a decade and throughout all this period it has been subject to various kinds of attacks by bourgeois and bourgeois nationalist ideologists, by theoreticians and publicists. They stubbornly allege that it is not a reflection of historical reality, but a "bureaucratic" and "Party" directive which, they maintain, limits the development of national cultures, imposing on each a definite dose of national elements.

Quite arbitrarily, these "specialists" declare that it suppresses the national roots of culture and the arts, sterilizing their national individuality by allegedly reducing the *national* to mere form; they also claim that it leads to the levelling and unifying of national cultures and that, in general, it is a cleverly designed weapon for fighting these cultures.

But in the course of a severe ideological struggle, the Marxist-Leninist theoretical thought has defended its formula from encroachments and attempts to distort it, and has proved its vital strength and validity as a profoundly substantial scientific thesis reflecting historical reality.

The socialist content of Soviet culture lies in its socialist ideals and ideology, as well as in the socialist nature of the social relations it reflects. Naturally, all this is essentially uniform in all our national cultures, the same as are the ideals, ideologies, and social and class structures of all the socialist nations (although certain slight distinctions are so far preserved).

Nevertheless, this uniform socialist content of Soviet culture — which by no means indicates the uniformity of

the subject, material or the nature of description in so far as literature and the arts are concerned (on the contrary, it implies their diversity), but is a singleness of communist ideology and Party principles — is manifest in different national forms. The national form of Soviet culture is to be found in its ethnic and historical exactness; it is the national form of expression of its socialist content, it is that national material in which this content finds its concrete manifestation and implementation. Such material is represented in the first place by the national language which is a direct and indispensable tool of culture, it is also the specific national features of social and folk daily life, of the living conditions, the folk customs, the national cultural traditions, the variety of means of national artistic expression including those special colors of nature, the "reminiscences" of native history, technological know-how and folk craftsmanship of which the latter is, in part, presented by the artistic embellishment of homes, household items, etc.

As we see, the entity of national form is made up of rather diversified components. In addition, these components are not passive, but are in a state of continuous movement and development.

The sociological "status" of Soviet culture, socialist in content and national in form, by no means reduces or hinders its national elements. All the more so, in view of the dialectics of its form and content. To regard this culture as being exclusively international (socialist) in content and strictly national in form would be utterly erroneous, because its international and national characteristics are inherent to both content and form. As a matter of fact, its national elements include those that are also international: national is not only something which shows distinctions between different nations (referred to as "specific national features"), but also something common to all.

On the other hand, the international is not devoid of national elements (which fact was more than once stressed by Vladimir Lenin), but is something peculiar to many nations, something common to all of them. Whenever literature and the arts are in question — specifically, their artistic (aesthetic) content and artistic (aesthetic) form — then the presence of international and national elements in both content and form becomes clearly apparent.

This very fact provides comprehensive and fruitful reciprocal effects among the national cultures, not only rendering an impact on the ideological-thematical and subject-matter motifs, but also on the methods of artistic perception and the styles and techniques of artistic expression. Here, national gains become sooner or later international (i.e., they become available to all nations), simultaneously forming a contribution to the world arsenal of artistic methodologies and styles.

Each national culture, in turn, is constantly supplied from this world arsenal, relying on this international ideological and aesthetical level in its further creative endeavors and search, and continuously developing and enriching its artistic ideas and means of expression.

The dialectics of the *international* and the *national* in culture, in literature and the arts, being a general law of their existence, is, at the same time, expressed in a special manner within a multinational socialist society. Here the international side of culture, literature and the arts receives tremendous support and an impetus from the objective historical processes in the internationalization of social life.

The relationships among separate cultures within a socialist society are, at the same time, basically changed. It is not merely the contacts, borrowings, reciprocal effects, etc. (mostly on the level of the creative intelligentsia), emerging as permanent factors of world cultural development, but, by and large, a higher level of interconnections: an intergral interaction of multinational cultures and the creating on this basis of such regularities, facts and motive forces which would be encompassed by the category of a "single socialist culture (literature and the arts) of the multinational Soviet people."

This certainly does not imply the engulfing of the *national* by the *international,* but means being *multinational* —which indicates the unity and rapprochement of separate cultures, as well as the further flourishing of the *national* on an *international* basis.

A tremendous process of enriching the content and expanding the form of the *national* is taking place: "Upon being assimilated by the culture of a certain people, the *international* becomes their *national* gain — incidentally, this was exactly the case with the international communist

outlook," reads the joint monograph *Leninism and the National Question Under Modern Conditions* (Moscow, 1974). Accordingly, the entire tremendous scale of socialist reality becomes that of the life of every nation, with the whole content of socialist culture turning into the inner wealth of every nation.

Becoming internationalized to an ever greater extent, national cultures open up such horizons of social psyche and emotionality for their respective nations, contribute such new ideas, cultural experience, tastes, etc., which, being gradually absorbed by society and impressed on it through the new social and psychological reactions, become, in turn, the relevant cultural, literary and artistic standards.

The impetuous development and successes reached by all national cultures, and the process of their entering the spiritual life of other nations and that of the entire socialist community, promote the Soviet people's internationalist self-consciousness, enriching and broadening their self-knowledge as a singleness of spirit and action of all the socialist nations, as a historical realization of their joint creative efforts and common social experience.

This new stage in the interaction of cultures within our society and the new level in their unity required theoretical reflection and generalization. That was why the classical formula of Soviet culture, socialist in content and national in form, was supplemented with a third component — "internationalist in spirit and character" — by General Secretary of the CC of the CPSU Leonid Brezhnev in his report *On the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.*

The aforementioned, therefore, implies the following conclusion: the internationalist spirit and internationalist orientation by no means deprive national cultures of their individuality, neither do they suppress their national roots and their best folk traditions. On the contrary, they add to their potentialities, broaden their ideological and artistic horizons, mobilize their inward reserves, helping each nation retain its individuality, so that it can truly "develop its strength and mature," as our famous poet Pavlo Tychyna once put it. All this is especially eloquent in the national literatures of the peoples of the USSR which are components of a single Soviet literature.

The Unity and Diversity of Literature of Socialist Realism

Soviet literature has been multinatioinal from its very inception. Ukrainian literati such as Ivan Franko, Lesya Ukrainka, Mikhailo Kotsyubynsky, Pavlo Tychyna and Stepan Vasylchenko; Byelorussian men of letters — Yanka Kupala, Yakub Kolas, Maxim Bogdanovich, their Latvian counterparts — Edward Veidenbaum, Janis Rainis, Andrei Upits, the Lithuanian writer Julius Janonis, the Tatars Habdulla Tukai and Fatikh Amirkhan, the Osset Kosta Khetagurov, the Tajik Sadriddin Aini, the Azerbaijanians Alekper Sabir and Jalil Mamedkuladze, the Georgians David Kldiashvili and Shalva Dadiani, the Abkhazian Dmitri Gulia, the Armenians Ovanes Tumanian, Avetik Isaakian and Akop Akopyan, and others — stood side by side with such Russian men of letters as Maxim Gorky, Alexander Serafimovich and Vladimir Mayakovsky, at the cradle of the revolutionary, democratic and proletarian writing which gradually developed into the literature of Socialist Realism.

Mentioned above are only the most outstanding names, but even this list suffices to make one understand on what a large geographical, historical and national scale were sown the seeds of the socialist spirit from which stemmed the strong shoots of a new culture. How far from the truth are the allegations of our ill-wishers that socialist culture and Socialist Realism are an artificial phenomenon, devoid of historical roots and national ground!

Ever since the start of the Great October Socialist Revolution, other national detachments of revolutionary litterateurs grew in strength side by side with the mighty and brilliant phalanx of Russian proletarian men of letters.

Apart from the classic writers mentioned before, the Russians D. Furmanov and Demyan Byedny, O. Fadeev, M. Sholokhov, N. Tikhonov, V. Lugovskoy, Yu. Lebedinsky and Vsev. Ivanov; the Ukrainians Yu. Yanovsky, P. Panch, A. Holovko and M. Bazhan; the Byelorussians Ts. Gartnoy, Z. Byadulya, M. Charat, Kuzma Chorny, M. Linkov and K. Krapiva; the Armenians Ye. Charents, S. Zoryan and A. Bakunts; the Kazakhs S. Seifullin, S. Mukanov, M. Auezov; the Uzbeks H. Niyazi and Aibek; the Azerbaijanians J. Jabarli, S. Akhundov, Samed Vurgun and S. Rustam; the Georgians G. Tabidze, L. Kiacheli and S. Chikovani; the Tatars H. Ibragimov and Musah Jalil; the Chuvash M. Sespel; the Buryat H. Namsaraev; the Yakut P. Oyunskiy; the Karelian Janis Virtaanen and many other sons of all the nations were the creators of Soviet literature.

It is typical that most of those who laid the foundation of the proletarian literature of their nations, those who set up the first milestones on untravelled creative roads, belonged to the cohorts of fighters for Soviet power during the October battles. And those like Dmitri Furmanov, Saken Seifullin and others were the legendary heroes of the Civil War.

The ardent revolutionary writings of the newly born proletarian literature were multinational from the very start. "The generation which first led the stormy attack on the old world," stressed the Uzbek writer Laziz Kayumov with understandable pride, "had in its arsenal the militant verse of Vladimir Mayakovsky, Demyan Byedny, Hamzi Hakim-Zade, Saken Seifullin and many other poets — bards of the revolution." We Ukrainians might add to these the names of Vasyl Chumak, Pavlo Tychyna and Volodymyr Sosyura.

Taking an active part in lying the foundations of Soviet literature were such representatives of the older generation of Soviet multinational intelligentsia as Stepan Vasylchenko in Ukraine, Alexander Shirvanzade and Derenik Demirchyan in Armenia, those classics of Azerbaijanian literature like Jalil Mamedkulizade, the akhyn* Jambul Jabaiev, the Lezghin ashug** Suleiman Stalsky and the Osset writer Arsen Kotsoiev.

* Caucasian poet and singer;
** Minstrel in Kazakhstan and Kirghizia.

The first All-Union Congress of Soviet writers in 1934 was a significant landmark in setting up and consolidating the multinational literature of Socialist Realism. The very composition of the Congress participants eloquently testified to the internationalist character and scale of the new, proletarian literature.

It's quite sufficient to mention but a few names of those whose speeches were the highlights of the Congress: Maxim Gorky, Alexei Surkov, Demyan Byedny, Ilya Ehrenburg, Alexander Fadeev, Yuri Olesha, Nikolai Asayev, Simeon Kirsanov, Isaac Babel, Leonid Leonov, Fyodor Gladkov, Olexander Korniychuk, Leonid Pervomaiski, Petro Panch Mykola Bazhan, Ivan Mykytenko, Mikhail Javakhishvili, Sadriddin Aini, Alexander Shirvanzade, Marietta Shaginyan, Aksel Bakunts, Yegishe Charents, Paolo Yashvili, Mikhas Linkov, Ali Nazim, Linard Laitzen, Lidiya Seifullina...

Present at the Congress — not only as guests, but as its organizers — were also prominent writers who represented European revolutionary and proletarian literature: Marthin-Andersen Nexo (Holland), Johannes Becker and Oscar-Maria Graft (Germany), Jean-Richard Bloch and Louis Aragon (France), Raphael Alberti and Maria-Teresa Leon (Spain), Anthal Hidash (Hungary), Bruno Jasenski (Poland), and many others, who regarded the young Soviet multinational literature as the vanguard of world communist literature.

The atmosphere at the Congress was permeated with enthusiasm, with mutual understanding on the part of the multinational litterateurs, and with a sense of awareness of all the profundity of their spiritual and cultural pluralism and, at the same time, their social unity. The numerous supplementary reports on national literatures went into their historical roots and described the cultural treasures of the many different peoples, as if putting them on an "all-Union status." Every speech was an appeal for a mutual exchange of knowledge. This wasn't only a problem of knowledge, but also an inherent need of creative writing under new conditions.

Marietta Shaginyan put this very well indeed. Calling on the delegates to carry out "comparative studies of the national literatures of our Soviet Union," she said that the Congress was only the first step toward "our boundlessly

expanding that experimental field in which we shall be able to set forth and decide the question of our writing craftsmanship."

Hence, the principle of multinationality was put into the very foundation of Soviet literature from the start. This multinationality was not regarded as some mechanical conglomeration or as neighboring separate parts, but as an organic and regular interaction called forth by inner necessity.

In this connection, I cannot help but point out the fact that to a considerable extent we owe this keen and lofty understanding of multinational Soviet literature, and culture in general, to the ideas and practical endeavors of the great Russian proletarian writer Maxim Gorky. He declared: "The art of writing — fiction — helps people achieve a mutual understanding; the workers and peasants of the Union of Socialist Soviets must be well informed about their neighbors who speak other languages, because the unity of their goal — the creating of new forms of national life — makes it imperative. The better people of various nationalities know each other's psyche ("soul"), the more unanimous, successful and quicker will be their advance toward the great goal set."

In 1928-1929, M. Gorky made a number of trips to Ukraine, Byelorussia, Azerbaijan, Armenia, Georgia, Tataria and North Ossetia in order to get acquainted on the spot with the social and cultural construction in the national republics. He made, in part, the following conclusion from his impressions:

"It is necessary to maintain mutual exchanges of creative gains. Russian translations of Georgian men of letters must be published in Moscow; the same applies to Armenians and Tatars (having in mind those in Azerbaijan — I.D.). Russian litterateurs, in turn, must have their manuscripts published in the national languages in Tiflis,* Kharkiv, Kazan and elsewhere. Such reciprocal exchanges of experience will undoubtedly facilitate the process of general rapprochement and will help people know each other better..."

In his well-known report to the First All-Union Congress of Soviet Writers, the report which set the tone of

* former name of Tbilisi, capital city of the Georgian SSR — Ed.

the entire work of the Congress, Maxim Gorky stressed that "the literature of all our republics made up of different nationalities, which was written in various languages, emerges as a single whole for the use of the revolutionary proletariat of all countries and for other world literatures that are friendly toward us." He also considered it important to indicate that "Soviet literature is not only literature of the Russian language, it is an all-Union literature."

"So far as I am concerned," he further stated, "I have no reasons or intentions whatsoever to single them out (the litterateurs from the fraternal republics — **I. D.**) as occupying a special place, because each of them not only works for his respective nation, but also for all peoples of the Union of Socialist Republics and of its Autonomous regions. History has made them just as responsible for their work as their Russian counterparts."

Naturally, Russian literature, as the most developed historically, has played the greatest part in forming and developing Soviet revolutionary literature, as well as in forming and developing the method of Socialist Realism which is peculiar to all Soviet literature. It has also served as an example for, and an aid to, the other national literatures.

It is common knowledge that the creative works and the personalities of Maxim Gorky and Vladimir Mayakovsky made a tremendous impact on the ideological and creative endeavors of the most outstanding literati from the revolutionary camp — writers of all nations.

Mikhail Sholokhov's epic prose turned out to be a powerful motive force in the development of Socialist Realism in literature. "The beneficial influence of his ardent creative endeavors," testified the prominent Kabardinian writer Alim Keshokov, "was especially manifest in the formation and development of our national literatures upon which Soviet power bestowed a long life."

The all-Union publishing houses, literary organizations (especially the Single Union of Soviet Writers set up in 1934) and individual prominent literati with wide personal contacts such as Alexander Fadeev, Nikolai Tikhonov, Pavlo Tychyna and others (not to speak of Maxim Gorky and Vladimir Mayakovsky) all rendered a great deal of creative and practical assistance to the men of letters of the other nationalities. Alexander Fadeev, in particular, who

had long been at the head of the Union of Soviet Writers, was distinguished by his comprehensive interpretation of the needs of national literatures and did much to support the writers representing national minorities. A quotation from his speech about the Osset writer Arsen Katzoev may serve as an example:

"We must take care of and properly value... the Osset men of letters who are the living witnesses of the past of Osset literature and who have linked this past with the present day..."

All these were episodes in the variegated cultural and revolutionary activities aimed at the implementation of the national policy of the Communist Party, the party which rejected both the national liquidation stand of the Left and the national deviationalism of the Right, aiming at treating all national cultural heritages with consideration, at aiding small nations, and at developing national cultures and helping them to prosper under conditions of mutual support and rapprochement.

Emphasis should be put on the fact that this atmosphere of purposeful and continuous brotherly mutual support in national and cultural construction, an atmosphere that has been raised to the level of state politics, forms a principally new and unprecedented phenomenon in world history, and that this is a creation of socialism. It also seems of equal importance to remind oneself that an altogether different atmosphere prevails nowadays in the bourgeois world...

And so, from the very start, there has never been any kind of national exclusiveness, narrowness or hegemonic tendencies in the aforementioned objectively leading part played by Russian literature. On the contrary, the Russian revolutionary spiritual tradition developed, to a considerable extent, through the spiritual and revolutionary experience of all the nations of former tsarist Russia. Soviet Russian literature imbibed much from the spiritual treasure troves of their neighboring peoples, and broadly reflected the active participation of representatives of other nations in the all-Russian revolutionary struggle, as well as its own multinational problems and international character.

A "specifically national" theme — the theme of the revolutionary awakening of once colonial nations, the theme of their becoming socialist nations during their

progress in socialist construction, the theme of establishing the internationalist relations of friendship and brotherly mutual assistance among these fraternal nations and their Russian counterparts — appeared in the literature of the 1920s and quickly gained ground. The reasons for this were the special importance which the national aspect of socialist reconstruction acquired, as well as the basic transformations in the so-called "national provinces," alongside the broadening of the geographic and national scope of the revolutionary process. A case example of profound and emotional insight into this theme was Bruno Jasenski's well-known novel, *Man Changes His Skin.* It is also worth noting that Soviet Ukrainian literature was among the first to turn to the above theme — it suffices to recollect Ivan Le's *Intermontane Romance,* or Oleksa Desnyak's *Turhaysky Falcon,* etc.

In the meantime, apart from Soviet Russian literature, its Ukrainian, Byelorussian, Georgian, Armenian, Azerbaijanian, Uzbek, Kazakh, Tatar, Bashkir and other national counterparts were becoming increasingly successful. In an ever widening stream they flowed into the deep river of the artistic, image-bearing literary reflection of the ideals and experience of the revolution, reproducing its human, social and psychological picture and its deep-going processes of socialist transformation.

The picture of the revolution and socialist transformation thus became ever more what one might call a multiplicity of voices and of languages, progressing, despite various nationalist hangovers, and revealing various facets and different national aspects of its image. And just as the objective links between the socialist nations could only lead to the creation of a single multinational Soviet people, so could the drawing closer together of their spiritual lives, their interpenetration, and the joining of their national cultural trends into a single whole of the spiritual self-consciousness of socialism, only lead to the development of the internationalist spirituality and culture of the Soviet people. This culture is not a mere selected fragment of socialist national cultures, but is a most complete expression of their very lives. Neither can it be approached simply as a sum total, a collection of these cultures, because it is their synthesis, in that the interaction of socialist national cultures guided by a single socialist

ideology forms a new level of regularities and a new qualification of its supreme nature.

This is a single Soviet culture which is progressing in a variety of singular national forms inherent to the many peoples inhabiting the USSR, and which has dozens of inimitable national appearances that shine like pure crystals with their countless multitude of facets. This is a single Soviet literature which is today proclaimed to the world not in several languages, as it did in the dawn of its existence, but in almost a hundred tongues of the nations and nationalities of the Soviet Union, including the many tongues of the national minorities who, prior to the revolution, did not even have a written language of their own.

Soviet Man— Master of Enormous Multinational Cultural Wealth

Each nation within a socialist society visualizes its spiritual world through the prism of its own national culture which has absorbed the gains of others and which exists by the cultural and spiritual categories and phenomena common to all the other socialist nations. In addition, each national community is acquainting itself to an ever growing extent with the gains of different national cultures.

Today, practically all literatures and cultures in the USSR "work for" the spiritual world outlook of Soviet man. Spiritual discoveries made within one national culture are quickly made use of by all the nations, adding to the creative vision of their artistic personalities, as if implanting into one socialist nation at least a small part of the "soul" or spirit of another socialist nation. Every nation's own historical experience becomes by and large a common experience, enriching the spiritual world of man in any nation, making each man more receptive to the values of other nations and more inwardly involved with their once strange and irrelevant historical lot in life. The understanding of others, when all is said and done, enriches one's own self-comprehension.

Such classical writings of Soviet novelists as Mikhail Sholokhov's *And Quiet Flows the Don,* Alexei Tolstoy's *The Road to Calvary,* Yuri Yanovsky's *The Riders* and *Four Sabers,* Alexander Serafimovich's *The Iron Torrent,* Alexander Fadeev's *The Debacle,* Dmitri Furmanov's *Chapayev,* Nikolai Ostrovsky's *How The Steel Was Tempered,* etc.— seem to exhaust the theme of the purifying avalanche of the Great Revolution, of the birth in its inferno

of the New Man, of the lofty social and historical nature of the awakening of the popular masses, and of the "optimistic tragedy" of the death of the old world and the birth of the new. Still, this theme has currently been continued with such excellent creations as Sabit Mukanov's *Botagoz,* Berdy Kerbabayev's *A Decisive Step,* Yuri Smolych's *The Wide Dnieper Roars and Groans, Abdiyhamil* Nurpeyisov's *Blood and Sweat,* Alexandras Gudaitis-Guzjaviecius *The Truth of Blacksmith Ignotas,* as well as works by Sadriddin Aini, Gafur Guliam, Abdulla Kakhkhara, Mukhtar Auezov, Antii Timonen, and many others. Today every national culture has its own "fund" of epic writings about the revolutionary times, a fund being continuously replenished, enriching and broadening our knowledge of that period, deepening and contributing to the historic self-consciousness of Soviet international society.

Let us now take another stage of Soviet history: the socialist transformation of the countryside and collectivization. To a large part of the Soviet people, this has also become a part of history, as for them literature forms the major source of knowledge about it, and, even more so, the main source of their emotional perception of those years. As regards our literature, this theme, like that of the revolution, has been and remains one of the key themes for it is deeply rooted in the social and psychological foundations of the life of the people and their historical destiny. Soviet literature has always painted and continues to paint a vast, nationally colorful and detailed picture illustrating a whole historical epoch, from the beginning of socialist transformations in the rural areas in the 1920s up to the second half of the forties when farmers in the Baltic Republics and in the western regions of Ukraine, Byelorussia and Moldavia first set out along the road of socialism. M. Sholokhov's *The Virgin Soil Upturned,* F. Panfyorov's *Ingots,* L. Kiacheli's *Gradi Bigva,* A. Holovko's *Weeds,* H. Tyutyunnyk's *Whirlpool,* A. Saxe's *Up the Mountain,* R. Sirge's *Land and People,* I. Avijus's *A. Village on Crossroads,* also works by S. Zalygin, M. Alexeev, M. Stelmakh, K. Hordiyenko, and other men of letters representing all national literatures, took part in creating this picture. These names and titles do not merely show the territorial and chronologic scope and the geographic and outward national diversity. They present a breath-taking, grand and three-

dimensional panorama of history expressing the destiny, experience and the concrete nature of the development of every single nation, their types and emotions, revealing the deep roots of every national existence. Taking it as a whole, it is a process of compiling the great annals of the deeds and ordeals, ideas and aspirations of many peoples. It continuously unveils vignettes of the countless paths which merge into the difficult road travelled by tens of millions of our people toward a new life...

Take the 1941-1945 Great Patriotic War! Just as the friendship of Soviet peoples was tempered and strengthened in its blazing furnace, the war theme, as an art form, became the subject of joint creative endeavors on the part of litterateurs of the various nations. Both in life and literature, representatives of all the nations combined their efforts and achievements, forming a single whole, so that the general picture would be hardly possible to perceive if even one nation were to be overlooked.

"I was 15 when I first heard the excellent verse by P. Tychyna and P. Antokolsky, M. Rylsky and M. Rylenkov, A. Surkov, and O. Tvardovsky who wrote about the war," recollects Sergei Baruzdin, Russian writer of a more younger generation. And it is not mere coincidence that both the names of Ukrainian and Russian poets are mentioned in his recollections. In the war years the all-Union significance and impact of the creative works of the best Ukrainian litterateurs, as well as those of their counterparts from all the other peoples of the USSR, became more clearly apparent than ever before. Their writings were eagerly awaited all over the country, and they reached the remotest parts of the Land of Soviets, uniting people of different nations.

Below is a characteristic recollection by the Russian writer O. Shestinsky, participant of the Days of Russian Literature recently held in Kazakhstan: "Being a resident of Leningrad, Kazakhstan is especially dear to me... This happened in the severe year of 1941. Leningrad under siege. Barricades were to be seen everywhere. And all of a sudden thousands of leaflets carrying Jambul's verse flew all over the city. They read: 'People of Leningrad! My Children! People of Leningrad, you are my pride!' To us, these words of the great bard were proof that we weren't cut off from the rest of the country, that we were still part

of the Soviet land in general, and Kazakhstan in particular."

The general picture of the Great Patriotic War is today unthinkable to the Soviet community without O. Honchar's *The Standard-Bearers* and *Man and Arms,* O. Korniychuk's *The Front,* P. Tychyna's *Burial of a Friend,* A. Malyshko's *Prometheus,* M. Stelmakh's *A Big Family,* L. Pervomaisky's *Wild Honey,* partisan stories by V. Koyachenko and Yu. Zbanatsky, novels and stories which proved a significant event in the spiritual life of the whole Soviet Union, by the Byelorussian V. Bykov, such as *Onslaught, Sotnikov, Obelisk, To Live to See Daybreak,* etc., without J. Avijus's *Lost Home,* O. Yoseliani's *Rain of Stars,* or without the poetry of Musah Jalil, Samed Vurgun, Maxim Tank and many others. Add to these such unforgettable writings as O. Bek's *The Volokolamsk Highway,* L. Leonov's *Seizing Velykoshumsk,* K. Simonov's *Days and Nights* and his later epic prose, A. Tvardovsky's *Vasili Tyorkin,* Yu. Bondarev's *Hot Snow,* A. Chakovsky's *Blockade,* and O. Berggolz's *Daytime Stars,* and you will be still far from exhausting the list which is being continuously added to.

Our considerable achievements in illustrating the Soviet people's exploits during the Great Patriotic War were properly valued at the 25th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. "Recreating the past, the arts bring up the Soviet patriot and internationalist," said General Secretary of the CC of the CPSU Leonid Brezhnev in his Report to the Congress.

Men of letters of all nations and generations return again and again to the theme of the Great Patriotic War, placing a growing emphasis on penetrating ever deeper into the ideological, ethical and psychological content of conflicts born of war, and on what might be called making an ideological and moral, as well as phychological, summary of that great and severe combat between two different social and political worlds, and on analyzing the sources of Soviet man's spiritual strength. Today, in approaching the time of the Great Patriotic War, Soviet Ukrainian literature does not fall behind other national literatures — for example, Petro Hurinenko's recent novel, *One Life,* or such a unique literary creation as *A Word After Execution* by Vadym Boyko.

If we look back over the last and most significant 20

years in our history, when a mature socialist society was built and the country entered the period of communist construction, we shall discover that the themes of developing and deepening the political and social democracy of our society, of the people's social activity, of the Party's linking up with the life of the people and the creativities of the masses — form one of the leading literary trends of this period. Its various aspects have been brought out in the novels of Russian authors (G. Nikolaeva's *Battle on the Road,* D. Granin's *After the Wedding* and *Heading for the Thunderstorm,* Ye. Maltseva's *Visit Every Home),* also in the writings of V. Ovechkin, Yu. Dorosh, V. Fomenko and F. Abramov, in the novels of Ukrainian literati — such as M. Stelmakh's *Truth and Falsehood,* O. Honchar's *Tronka,* and H. Leberecht's *Under One Roof,* in the novel *Confluence* by the Azerbaijanian writer M. Ibragimov, and so on. And yet problems of principal all-Union importance, problems common to all the republics and peoples of the USSR, arise in these literary creations in their whole national and vital expressiveness, enriching Soviet society's joint experience, adding greater depth and insight to people's perception of the historical processes.

Now, as we turn our eyes to our actual reality, we will see that some of its social and ethical problems are perceived by Soviet people of different nations through the artistic interpretations of Chinghiz Aitmatov, that this reality is revealed and generalized through the philosophic and poetic vision of Eduardas Myezhelaitis and Justinas Mercinkjavicus, and through the carefully weighed comprehension found in the poetry of David Kugultinov, Kaisin Kuliev and Rasul Gamzatov who imbibed their ideas from the crystal wells of the age-old spiritual and ethical criteria and clear-sighted morals of their own peoples. We shall see that all these have also become a part of our national and all-Union spiritual treasure house.

Our Ukrainian literature has made its own special contribution — warranted as it was by the original nature of its historical experience, national psyche, artistic traditions and stylistic trends — to elaborating on all the themes and motifs common to Soviet literature. In the theme of the October Revolution, for example, they contribute a dynamic dramatism which ensues from the complex national aspect, from class and national conflicts, from

the splitting and discord inflicted by nationalism, from motifs devoted to overcoming nationalism, and to motifs of friendship and unity with the Russian proletariat. In the 1920s the theme of the village and collectivization was based on a scathing exposé of the kulaks founded on the Ukrainian classical literary traditions. In the theme of the Great Patriotic War, we find the mourning for Nazi-enslaved Ukraine (poetry), also elements of romanticism and lyricism (prose), and emphasized moral responsibility (as in O. Honchar's highlighting Soviet man's kind, big-heartedness and the firmness of his morals), etc.

Shattering revolutionary cataclysms, and the scope of creating a new world, mark the heroic and romantic trends in the writings by Yu. Yanovsky with his straightforward and deep-going reflections on the destiny of one's homeland and keen awareness of one's patriotic responsibility, Dovzhenko's commanding emotionalism and moral and poetic finesse, and A. Holovko's social analysis. All these features inherent to the creative endeavors of Ukrainian litterateurs became a noticeable trait in today's spiritual image.

The spiritual worlds of P. Tychyna, M. Rylsky, V. Sosyura, M. Bazhan, A. Malyshko and L. Pervomaisky exerted an impact on the entire Soviet Union. In other words, their creations did not pass unnoticed through the living, everyday, consciousness of Soviet man, just as they did not leave unaffected the whole structure of the "Soviet spirit." A number of their poetic formulas have become a standard in outlining one or another moment in the "biography" of our society. M. Rylsky, for instance, has contributed to the general Soviet cultural practice (and this is one of the cases of sound humanistic orientations of society in the times of spiritual maturity and at the new stage of development marked with a special, socially careful approach) with his unique poetic interpretation of wise spiritual balance and life harmony such as widely epitomized phrases, "roses and grapes" and "beautiful and useful," which he understood as "two supporting wings" of man's happiness...

And what about Stepan Oliynyk's satirical verse so vivaciously translated into Russian, and regularly published on the pages of the *Pravda* newspaper, and thus available to readers throughout the Soviet Union? Do they not

add Ukrainian national coloring to the interpretation of certain features and conflicts in our present-day social existence — i.e., giving them a Ukrainian national tint — the way these features and conflicts are viewed by millions of people? Do they not add to the ideological and artistic perception of things and their image-bearing imprints in the consciousness of the masses?

One interesting detail is that the entity of the friendship of Soviet peoples as such — the very image of our internationalist existence, and the formula of the internationalist spirit of the Soviet people — have entered, or are now entering, the consciousness of one and all, as in Tychyna's well-known and remarkably accurate definition: *The Feeling of One Single Family.*

The aforementioned are, of course, only separate, or more or less eloquent, episodes of the rich spiritual life of the Soviet peoples. These are only separate threads serving as examples, the threads woven into a large tapestry of one single culture, and forming only separate components of the all-embracing ramified structure known as the "Soviet spirit." In general, the representation of the Ukrainian and other non-Russian nations in this single Soviet spiritual aggregate — even in its everyday mass model — is far larger and more authoritative. This fact has to be stressed so as to refute bourgeois — and, in this case, specifically nationalist — propaganda whose version is that everything Soviet, or all that is Soviet in general, is to be read as exclusively Rusian, and imposed on all the other nations within the USSR, or that it is to be understood as a camouflage concealing "Russian hegemony..."

Yet another thing could be mentioned along the same lines; that the extremely comprehensive, versatile and composite hero of our time, this complex ideal of "Soviet man" — this fruit of mass imagination fed by our historical reality, various kinds of documentary information, mass media and the like, or influenced by literary-artistic images — reveals features inherent to the worthiest and most distinguished sons of all the peoples inhabiting the Soviet Union. Their lives and exploits, their ideals and their spirit, have been united and accumulated in people's imagination, and were transformed there into a single historic tradition, a single image, a single standard of the Soviet way of life, i.e., "Soviet man," and the Soviet ideal.

And shouldn't we recall the favorite literary personages who have been inspiring many a generation of Soviet youth?

If one took into account only those literary and artistic works and the characters they portray that could be regarded as most "productive" from the standpoint of an artistic analysis (i.e., social knowledge) of various traits of the Soviet character, of the social and spiritual self of this Soviet man — the list would be a very long one indeed, and it would include all the nationalities, for that matter. In every creative work of this kind one would find that the author gives a concrete presentation of ordinary, and yet original, Soviet socialist people, endowing them with the highest national virtues of the working man, virtues that have come into flower during Soviet times, under socialism.

The socialist and developing communist personage is shown as a living embodiment of the national and popular ideal, as an ethical realization of the people's dream. The dialectics of the generally socialist and specially national features of "Soviet man" are brought out by monumental in-depth modeling of a composite artistic image or ideal of this "man" in both our literature and the arts: being a "law" of spiritual composition and a measure of spiritual scope for reasons of national modifications, the character of this general Soviet ideal simultaneously absorbs the people's richest essence which is continuously replenished and developed by means of their inner spiritual sources, and the historical scope and inexhaustible emotionality inherent to the concrete national character.

A joint elaboration of the image of this hero of modern socialist reality is one of the major spheres in the interaction of national literatures; and the principal community of ideals of such a hero in all national literatures is the most intimate channel of their interaction which involves the very ideological and psychological core of literature.

At the same time, the impact of literature upon life and its dependence upon life and on actual reality are also obvious in this problem. On the one hand, the community of artistic portrayals of Soviet man as the hero of our times in all national literatures helps achieve a similar community of ideals in real life; on the other hand, this same community of the artistic ideal is substantiated by, and relies upon, the unity of ideology and common moral and

political ideals, as well as upon the deep-going uniformity of historical reality in all the socialist nations.

Proceeding from this standpoint, the mutual contacts and the interaction of socialist national literatures in general are reflected in the spiritual, creative and aesthetical sphere of the fundamental social and historical actuality of real all-round mutual contacts of the interdependence and interaction of the socialist nations (although literatures, in their turn, exert an impact on the existential side of the process).

Just the same as the "general wholeness" of the Soviet people is the synthesis of the national "wholeness," just as their economic, political and spiritual potentials are the aggregate of the attainments and efforts of all the socialist nations, so the "general wholeness" of Soviet literature is the synthesis of the constituent national literary "wholeness," of which its standards and potentials are composed and dependent upon; in other words upon the joint efforts and gains of all these constituent literatures.

In order to understand how wide and reliable is the general national "front" of Soviet literature today, it is worth considering one of the most "fundamental" literary genres — epic prose, which has long, and rightfully, been regarded as a criterion of literary maturity. At present, the treasure house of Soviet epic writings comprises practically all the national literatures, including those which prior to the revolution had little, if any, epic prose.

And poetry! Here almost all the nations have been, and are still putting out galaxies of gifted bards among whom are many whose poetic endeavors form what one might call the "active funds" of all Soviet literature, and without whose names its modern history is inconcievable. Each of these names could embellish the literature of any culturally advanced nation. In our country, they belong to one multinational literature, adding their unique and invaluable national worlds to its great and boundlessly diversified wonderworld. Whole generations of young poets have risen in national literatures, many of whom have already won acclaim throughout the Soviet Union.

Just imagine all this abundance of poetic ideas, thoughts, visions, fantasies, emotions, colors, nuances of the national psyche, spiritual summaries of one's national history. What a tremendous wealth of people's experience

and wisdom! And all this wealth is available to any Soviet man, whatever his nationality, just as it is available to all national literatures, emerging as a sort of common heritage which permits them to further and more intensively develop their talent in a more diversified manner than they would if they relied exclusively upon their own creations.

The above proposition is also corroborated by the generally uplifted levels of all national literatures, by the resonance and immediate creative response of one literature to the successes achieved by the others, by the impetuous progress in a number of national literatures of those genres and forms which were never known before, as well as by the confident entering into professional literature of representatives of those nations and peoples who, prior to the revolution, did not even possess a written language. Suffice it to mention the names of the Chukchi writers Yuri Ritkheu and Victor Keulkuta, the Udegeis Jansi Kimonko, the Mansi Yuvan Shestalov, the first Eskimo poet Yuri Anko, the Nanai Yakim Samar, the Khakastsi Nikolai Domozhakov and Ivan Kotyushev, the Nivkha Vladimir Sangi... The fact alone that the writings of Yuri Ritkheu and Yuvan Shestalov have been published in many foreign (including European) languages and have received admiring comments from literary critics abroad, is sufficient evidence of the high level of young national literatures...

Are there many writers in Canada and the United States — such as the Indian, Eskimo, Chukchi or Lapp — who write in their mother tongues? Perhaps by merely posing this question one would become aware of all that huge gap between the status of national minorities in a socialist country and that in the world of capitalism, as well as of the difference between the national relations and social and cultural atmospheres.

As regards that burdensome and miserable heritage left by West European colonialism on the territories of Africa, India, Indonesia, etc., where vernaculars are still unable to reach the level of standard official languages, or where the languages of once distant metropolises still retain key positions in the intellectual life — no comment is needed.

Every time and everywhere capitalism proves its inability to ensure the multinational family of mankind a harmonious development of cultures and languages of all

peoples, or to adequately satisfy the national wants of all human groups. At the same time, it has demonstrated its impotence in not only trying to overcome the economic and political separation of humanity, but also in its attempts at patching up their cultural, spiritual and psychological differences. In fact, capitalism itself is the source of mankind's disunion, notwithstanding all its global and cosmopolitan trends.

The internationalization of spiritual life in its creatively valuable aspects (exchange of genuine cultural values, reciprocal acquaintance with national cultural heritages, the leveling of cultural advancements and rapprochement, mutual cultural enrichment, unity of creative endeavors and community of spiritual inspiration) is a spontaneous and inadequate process in a capitalist society, encompassing only its intellectual, upper strata (the elite). This process either does not reach the mass of the people at all, or falls down upon them in a perverse form of standardized cosmopolitan "mass" anticulture which, because of its being mechanical and spiritless, disunites people rather than unites them. The teachings, dreams and aspirations of great thinkers of the past concerning the forthcoming brotherhood of man under the token of the general human ideal, are still very far from reality in the world of today.

Even if there is a degree of outward rapprochement there, brought about by the oppressive standardization devoid of any creativity whatsoever, then their inner national lives remain disunited. Nations there do not interact with each other so that each grows stronger and reciprocally increases the common, joint creative potentialities of mankind. Inwardly, both the individual and the bulk of the people in the bourgeois world suffer from national and local one-sidedness (which at times turns into aggressive cosmopolitanism); they are forced to be content with a miserable share of the all-human spiritual and cultural potential, the world of mankind in their eyes being reduced to primitivism and ransacked beyond imagination — hence their presumption that they themselves are robbed of the very objectives of their advancement toward a worldwide community.

They are tragically inferior in so far as the general human ideal is concerned.

One of the glaring divergencies of the bourgeois world

is the fact that its industrial and technological development, its industrial and technological "globalization" are not accompanied by a relevant social, moral, psychological and cultural advancement, aimed at developing on a worldwide scale those genuine virtues of the man of the future, a wise and considerate master of the Earth, who will be able to cope with his world-historical mission. The bourgeois individual, on the contrary, remains narrow-minded, mentally deprived with his potentials unrealized. Living in the Space Age and outwardly adopting himself to its style, this individual, inside, belongs to the past: he is not spiritually prepared to face the vast scope and opportunities offered him by modern technological progress. It is not the bourgeois, nor the ruling circles of Western societies, but the working man and the Communist Party who are the bearers of the national and all-human ideal and the idea of worldwide historical progress of humanity.

The perverse character of bourgeois world contacts and bourgeois internationalization is thus the reason for their inability to provide efficient means of reaching a global community which has already become so pressing a necessity; neither are they capable of preserving nor joining national economic, spiritual and cultural resources and potentials to facilitate mutual progress, mutual enrichment and "mutual enlargement," nor of finding an effective and humane way out of the divergences between the part and the whole.

Certainly, if we take, for example, the spiritual aspect of life, then the processes of stepped-up cultural exchanges, active interconnections and the mutual influence of cultures are peculiar to the entire modern world, bourgeois socities included. But there they embrace only the elite in the first place, leaving intact, or effecting to a very small degree, the life of the bulk of the people; secondly, they acquire perverse forms because of national antagonisms which at times become hazardous to the very existence of cultures of separate nations, or are simply used for cultural and political expansion. That is why progressive cultural figures, communists topping the list — while upholding truly valuable contacts and equal cultural exchanges, the interaction of democratic cultures, their ideological connections, and so on — are at the same time waging a consistent struggle against the "cosmopolitization" of cultures,

revealing the dangerous nature of hindering this or that national culture, turning it into a second-rate one, belittling its national originality, etc.

In this respect and from this standpoint, the experience of the socialist Land of Soviets and its titanic, and yet carefully weighed, efforts are of special importance. Their purpose is the creation of an international mode of life for millions of people in which age-old spiritual values and cultural gains would not be lost or left on the roadside of history, but would become part of a ramified international cultural structure available to all nations, in which a man belonging to a particular nation would at the same time be international, in which a society, while living and developing in its own national forms and colors (which are being continuously changed and enriched), would simultaneously be an international society, joining separate national organisms into one single and supreme community. This society would also outline and reach the ristorical targets, generally human in character and scope, including those in the sphere of culture...

Already today we can witness, in our multinational (multicultural and multilingual) socialist society, large-scale and intensive processes of national cultures' entering a supreme community — the international culture of the Soviet people, and, simultaneously, their mastering the achievements of other national cultures, both directly and through the international culture of the Soviet people.

Man under socialism, remaining an active individual of a particular national culture, also becomes an individual of general Soviet culture, benefiting from the wealth of other socialist national cultures. The more successful this process in our country and the freer and broader the development of full-blooded national cultures within Soviet international culture, the greater the impact of the Soviet example upon the future ways of all humanity.

Socialist National Cultures: Channels of Mutual Influence and Ways of Interaction

The Soviet arts, the multinational arts of the multinational socialist community — are like a boundless sea fed by the deep and mighty rivers of the national arts, and by the abundant creative streams of all the peoples in the Soviet Union. Still, each of these rivers and streams is in turn replenished by the waters of the many tributaries, springs and lakes of native localities and their native cultures. Taken separately, they might hardly be noticed, but are all present in general Soviet culture; however, taken together, they stand out because of their accumulated creation — a markedly artistic phenomenon, because of the end result — national cultures. As a matter of fact, such prominent literary and artistic creations and outstanding cultural phenomena — which the popular Philistine opinion is inclined to reduce to their all being benefits of one or another culture, considering them to be the fruits of only individual endeavors — are in reality like chalk mountains formed over the epochs out of billions of minute sea shells (that are never afterward visible). They are the result of concentrated efforts, aspirations, inspirations, visions and the painstaking, "insignificant," work of numberless "rank-and-file" workmen of culture.

Naturally, in the individual commonplace understanding only a small part of all this mass of culture becomes cognizable. Many more facets of culture interact with each other solely on the artistic and professional level.

The inner-cultural worth and creative role of artistic phenomena are dissimilar both as to their popularity and scope of promulgation, and even to their value as cultural

"commodities" on the domestic international or world international market. Everthing that is kindled by the socialist ideal, that forms the spiritual life, the ideals, the moral and ethical system, tastes and wants of Soviet man living in different corners of our Motherland enters into one general Soviet culture.

Present in this international culture are not only phenomena of all-Union scope — those that are noticeable from any national point within the Soviet Union and are universally recognized — but also a great multitude of facts that are in one way or another involved in the common cultural life, plus a great many of what could be called "local reservoirs" feeding the mighty rivers that affect the cultural climate in the national regions.

There is always a great deal more to culture than the obvious. Take Sergei Prokofiev, for example. What were the springs and lakes which made the confluence which filled the composer's soul and gave him the strength to create his wonderland of modern music?

As one of the most outstanding composers of the 20th century and one of the cultural figures most internationalist in spirit (with his profound philosophic generalization and all-human dramatism, and with his paradoxical, deep and strong-willed spirit and universal language of music), he was, at the same time, pronouncedly national. His national spirit was inseparable from his creative self, which both formed a single whole, testifying that national elements are an inseparable component of the single musical culture of the peoples of the USSR and of the "musical sector" of the Soviet people's international culture. These elements are among the foundation stones of the further development of musical culture of all the Soviet nations.

The same can be said of the role played by another prominent composer of our time, Dmitri Shostakovich, whose monumental and deeply philosophical creativity became a kind of musical equivalent for the titanic and life-asserting outlook of the socialist age, and of the whole cultural panorama of the new world.

Take another distinguished composer of modern times and founder of the Soviet school of music, Aram Khachaturyan: what were the age-old sources he imbibed his creations from?

He enriched modern symphony, formed first and fore-

most under the influence of Russian classical music, with extraordinary, whimsical Oriental melodies and sharp contrasts of image-bearing themes, spontaneous improvisation and freshness of harmony born of musical folklore in Transcaucasia, ancient Armenian tunes, folk-classical mugams * and inspired improvisations of minstrels.

Thus the musical heritage of the peoples of Transcaucasia and the Soviet East and their thousand-year-old traditions, interpreted by the Soviet artist, also became one of the many components of modern international culture of the entire Soviet people.

A similar part was played along these lines by the creative endeavors of Uzeyir Gadzhibekov whose operas and musicals not only opened new ways for the development of Azerbaijanian music but also bestowed the musical gems of the Azerbaijanian people on present-day cultural life.

In 1928, Maxim Gorky, who had just returned from Capri and was then reacquainting himself with life in the Soviet Union by visiting a number of republics, wrote with a great deal of admiration about the priceless treasures of folk music of the nations and peoples in our country:

"Like streams flowing from all places — from the Zyryans, Buryats, Chuvashes, Maris, you name it — all these amazingly beautiful melodies are here for the benefit of future brilliant musicians."

Most of these streams, however, did not reach the Big World (just as the allegedly "non-existent" and, in reality, immeasurable artistic gains of many nations still remain undiscovered by mankind in general).

In the meantime, a gifted Mari composer, Ya. Eshpai, emerged on the scene who in his suites, rhapsodies, his opera *Myron Numarin* (written in collaboration with Spaddavekkia) and other compositions, absorbed and synthesized the musical "streams" of one of the nations mentioned by Gorky...

There are so many such "streams" (not only of music, but also of all other creative works) ensuing from all nations which await their discoverers, interpreters, talented

* Lit., fret: a kind of Azerbaijanian folk music performed on string instruments whose finger boards have over 70 frets called specifically (i.e., rast, shur, segyakh, etc.) and marked with a peculiar harmony — Ed.

performers and brilliant artists, and simply translators — those intermediaries between a nation and mankind!

What did the world, I mean the world of music, previously know about the music of peoples in Middle Asia? It simply didn't exist for that world: there was "no music" there, since there was no professional music as understood by Europeans, neither were there any European musical genres. And peoples like the Kazakhs, the Kirghiz, Turkmenians and Kara-Kalpaks were considered to be illiterate and devoid of any cultural traditions whatsoever (Europeans, however, didn't dare stick the same label on the Uzbeks and Tajiks whose cultures were older than the European heritage). In reality, all these nations possessed their own highly developed, though not professional, variegated folk cultures — but tsarism refused to let such nations develop them into modern national cultures.

All the natural skills and spiritual beauty of the peoples, their unique cultural treasures, all the countless gifted personalities born in their deeps — all were suppressed by tsarist autocracy. At best, they were permitted only for assimilation purposes, and there was no outlet for self-expression, and no gateway to world history. The road to world culture and to the expanses of all-human historic and spiritual development was mercilessly blocked for these nations. Yet this was nothing compared to the suppression of elementary national existence, self-expression and elementary social progress, education and citizenship. It suffices to mention Mukhtar Auezov's novels, *Abai* and *Abai's Road,* describing the sufferings of the Kazakh people...

After Auezov's novel, it would be worth reading another interesting book — an autobiographical novel, *School of Life,* by yet another Kazakh writer, S. Mukanov.

Sabit Mukanov had gone through a severe school of revolutionary struggle and, later, recollecting his youth, he drew a wide picture of the birth and maturing of Soviet Kazakh literature against the background of general revolutionary reconstruction of the people's life. This son of the working people, and writer, made his own self-analysis which simultaneously became the chronicles of the awakening and unleashing of the revolutionary forces of his people. After *Abai* and *Abai's Road,* this novel revealed a striking outburst of people's social activity and life-giving talent.

Only twenty years before, at the turn of the 20th century, people's educator Abai Kunanbaiev wrote, with deep sorrow and pain in his heart, about the estrangement of his people from historic activity, about their remoteness from the roads of world progress; he wrote about the want of individuals who could understand the conditions of their people and would be capable of waging a struggle for a better future...

And now we see a striking flare-up of revolutionary forces, a galaxy of gifted personalities and the gratifying fruits of social and historical creativity in all spheres of life when the people freed themselves from their chains with the coming of the Great October Revolution. And think of the people who were born afterward! As if they all had to make up for their fathers' involuntary disadvantages: age-old inertness and drowsiness, provincial stagnation and steppe life routine. How fast their professional arts, literature and science developed!

All the arts advanced on a national folk ground, oriented at a modern artistic level, considering and making use of the achievements of other, higher developed cultures — Russian culture in the first place (Ukrainian culture also influenced to a certain extent the maturing or development of other Soviet national cultures, but we shall come to that later).

National literatures registered an especially impetuous development, more often than not being in the lead of modernizing, along socialist lines, all other branches of culture. Back in the 1920s, for example, the Kirghiz poet Aali Tokombaev and the Kazakh Sabit Mukanov, under the influence of Vladimir Mayakovsky's poetry and creatively assimilating his experience, reorganized their traditional folk verse and created its new form, violating the then strict stanza rules, and thus expanding the expressive and intonational potentialities of their national poetry. This was, in fact, the beginning of a deep-going "reform" in the poetry of peoples inhabiting the Soviet East, involving a basic ideological and thematical reorganization which was brought out by revolutionary reality and the socialist way of life.

Mukhtar Auezov's novels *Abai* and *Abai's Road* were case examples of the synthesis of the national arsenal of artistic means of expression, with a principally new artist-

ic structure of modern literary genre. They became part of the history of Soviet novel-writing and formed an epoch in the development of Kazakh prose, books that clearly show the creative effects upon the author of prominent Russian prerevolutionary classical novelists, as well as of Alexei Tolstoy and Yuri Tynyanov. Together with the novel *Navoyi* by the Uzbek writer Aibek, they made quite an impact on the advancement of the historical novel in the literatures of peoples of the Soviet East.

Let us take yet another prominent representative of Soviet multinational literature, the late Berdi Kerbabaev, founder of Soviet Turkmenian literature and Hero of Socialist Labor.* It was with reason that the well-known Russian poet Alexei Surkov wrote:

"Back of his works, and as an original source of poetic inspiration, lay the deep-rooted and age-old traditions of epos and folk poetry handed down by word of mouth, as well as the creations of his forerunners — Makhtumkuli, Mollanepes and Kemine... Like most other trailblazers of young fraternal literatures, Kerbabaev not only enriched the new Turkmenian literature with his own writings, but also carried out a tremendous amount of work translating into his mother tongue the best creations of Russian classical and Soviet writers, thus adding to the valuables in the Turkmenian literary treasury."

Did not the founders and the classics of newly born Ukrainian literature travel similar roads? Are these not the same roads along which modern Ukrainian men of letters make their way today — under our conditions, improved as they are beyond comparison, side by side with their counterparts of all the other fraternal literatures? The answer is in the affirmative, because the creative ascent to the heights of modern, advanced world art and the simultaneous maximal and passionate usage of the age-old artistic gains of one's nation — its specific forms of emotional perception of beauty, its ways of the expres-

* An honorary title and the highest distinction for outstanding meritorious achievements in one's national economic and cultural activities. Instituted December 27, 1938, pursuant to a Decree of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Recipients are ceremoniously presented with the Order of Lenin and a Diploma of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. As of May 22, 1940, the "Hammer and Sickle" Gold Medal is granted simultaneously with the Order of Lenin — **Ed.**

sion and embodiment of its spirit — form the main principle of self-assertion and point out the main direction of progress for any vital national culture. It is thus that national arts and letters create artistic structures which form spiritual, psychological and aesthetic bridges linking a nation with the big world, bridges that help a nation exploit the wealth of this world and gather the fruits of its own artistic self-knowledge — that is to say, it obtains the most condensed knowledge about the world. These bridges are transpositions for the voice a nation to join in the choir of the world so that a nation may present evidence of its national spirit and historical attainments.

An ardent desire to give the big world the long cherished pearls of one's national art, an urge to perpetuate them for the good of the coming generations — has always been one of the stimuli of big art. Alisher Navoi once explained his usage of the mother tongue (Old Uzbek) in the following manner:

"This treasury has until now been hidden from people, and man's hands have so far never touched its things of beauty."

Navoi compared Old Uzbek with a "blooming orchard" which he could not but open, and did, for the rest of the world... A number of prominent writers and cultural figures have made, and still are making, similar searches to present their discoveries to the rest of the world.

Though this is a very important channel through which century-old treasures, traditions and new gains of national cultures pass into the multinational culture of the Soviet people, it is far from being the only one.

Another channel is the usage of other nations' cultural material by individual personalities in art and literatures in their creative endeavors (a practice becoming increasingly widespread and meaningful): this is of great importance from the standpoint of knowledge in general, internationalist education and the pure creative approach in particular. It is also evidence of a feeling of respect for other nations, or of visualizing them in a unique way — i. e., through the eyes of still other nations — forming sensitive and ethical grounds for international emotional and psychological compatibility.

It is worth recollecting here examples of Soviet writers using the material of other nations (for them, it was not a

mere formal response to a "programmed" international theme, but an inward urge to release their world outlook, a spiritual need, and a serious phase of the process of their creative maturing and developing): the unforgettable poems and public recitals by Vladimir Mayakovsky dedicated to Ukraine, Georgia, Azerbaijan, Tataria and Chuvashia; Fadeev's novel *The Last From Udege;* T. Syomushkin's *Alitet Goes Up The Mountains;* M. Shundyk's *The Fast-Running Deer;* Yu. Tryfonov's *Quenching Thirst;* K. Lordkipanidze's *Byelorussian Stories;* poems about Armenia and Kazakhstan by Y. Noneshvili; a series of poems about Ukraine by K. Kaladze and G. Abashidze; writings by Rasul Gamzatov and Kaisin Kuliev; Ye. Charents' poetic collections; *Georgian Verse* by N. Tikhonov; V. Lugovskoy's *Deserts and Springs for Bolsheviks;* and works by I. Selvinsky. Ukrainian authors have also made a tangible contribution in this regard. Ivan Le's *Intermontane Romance,* O. Donchenko's *Falcon's Heart,* O. Desnyak's *Turhaysky Falcon,* A. Turchynska's novel *'Ashkhabad, My Friend;* Yu. Zbanatsky's *Sespel;* V. Mysyk's Tajik and Uzbek poems; V. Koshevsky's Armenian poetry; I. Masenko's writings about Kazakhstan; L. Pervomaisky's *From the Pamirs Diary,* M. Bazhan's *Triptych on Simon Chykovani,* M. Nahnybida's *The Bells of Knatyn,* B. Stepanyuk's *Sespel's Dialogue with Ukraine,* O. Levada's play *Kamo and the Poem 'Chernyshevsky,'* many poems by P. Tychyna, M. Rylsky, M. Bazhan, A. Malyshko, M. Nahnybida, D. Pavlychko, and other poets.

Soviet writers and artists of all nations devoted their works to factual happenings, to memorable places and historical events, etc., which were associated, above all, with the unity of their nations; however, they acquire a broader general-revolutionary and, at times, symbolic significance that touched on international themes common to all Soviet literature: subjugating the Far North, the Dneproges, the Hungry Steppe or irrigating Central Asian deserts, Stalingrad, Kovpak's Partisan Raid in the enemy rear, and similar themes.

They also went into special aesthetic elaborations on the theme of the friendship of Soviet nations and portraying the Soviet people of diverse nations from the viewpoint of their mutual friendly relations, also on the theme of social, psychological, ideological and art-approach insight

into socialist internationalism and its comprehension and treatment from the standpoint of art. Then add to the above the literary creations dealing with other subject matter where the material is like living flesh that embodies the joint revolutionary struggle of front-line bravery under fire; or writings depicting the socialist labor efforts of people of various nations (A. Serafimovich's *The Iron Torrent,* O. Furmanov's *Conspiracy,* F. Gladkov's *Energy,* O. Honchar's *The Standard-Bearers,* plus almost all the noted books about the October Revolution and the Great Patriotic War).

Also present in these writings are their authors' "personal discoveries" of other nations and cultures *(Lessons in Armenia* by A. Bitov), stories about their trips and travels, and various information items dealing with different Soviet republics (a book of literary sketches by the Latvian author A. Pumpur entitled *From the Daugava to the Danube,* and V. Korotych's *Man at Home),* books on literary and artistic contacts, and those about prominent figures, writers and artists of various nations (N. Tikhonov's *Double Rainbow,* V. Goltsev's books on Georgian classics—particularly the one about Shota Rustaveli), and numerous periodical coverages, all of which are, in general, tremendously informative, educational, purely creative and of intimate and stimulating importance. K. Zelinski once quoted D. Furmanov who, upon returning from the town of Elista where he had attended the celebration of the 500-year jubilee of the Kalmyk epos *Dzhangr* and after visiting the town of Ordzhonikidze where he had taken part in the festivities of K. Khetagurov's 90th birth anniversary (there Fadeev made a presentation on Osset classic literature), said the following:

"It gives me pleasure to acquaint myself with the literary treasures of other nations. So far as I'm concerned, it is not only informative, but also an enjoyable experience... How many wonderful personalities we are now discovering in other nations! It's a great pity I didn't set to studying all this earlier. Now all I can do is to try my best to catch up."

Present in these writings are cases when the destiny of a writer of one nation turns out to be entirely, or to a great degree, linked with that of another nation to which he dedicates all, or a considerable part, of his creative endea-

vors (for example, P. Lukinnytsky whose writings are all about Tajikistan: *Travels Throughout the Pamirs,* a book *Tajikistan,* novels *The Land of Youth* and *Nisso;* P. Skosyryev, author of the book of verse *Poor Hassan,* of the novels *Explosion, Farkhad* and *The Archer,* and the book *Turkmenian Literature,* dedicated all his works to Middle Asia; the Ukrainian woman writer V. Cherednychenko who lived for several decades in the North Caucasus and then wrote about its people and their culture, and translated a collection of Nart epos, etc.), or when a representative of one nation masters another national literature and becomes a prominent figure in this field, but who in his creativity pays tribute to his own nation; or another who is influenced in his writings by impressions of his childhood in his native parts (Paustovsky, for instance, who, according to K. Zelinsky, "found colors in Ukrainian lyricism that were akin to his talent"). There is yet another remarkable personality worthy of special notice — the Armenian woman writer, M. Shaginyan, later an eminent Soviet litterateur, who in her ingenious and pronouncedly humanistic works has probably not overlooked a single Soviet nation, not to speak of many peoples throughout the world. You probably won't find many here who haven't read her excellent book *Taras Shevchenko.* Marietta Shaginyan is really a vigorous and tireless champion of internationalism and the friendship of nations and cultures.

Present in these writings are different biographical, civic and creative bonds, that tangled interwoven fabric of personal fates which reflects the interconnection of peoples' historical destinies and which can give a special internationalist tone to one's creativity and determine its content and the author's keen interest in one or another nation possibly leaving upon him special impressions. Ukraine, for example, was the homeland of many Soviet Russian poets and prose writers, Georgia was the homeland of V. Mayakovsky and the second homeland of P. Pavlenko who spent his youth and started his literary career there. N. Tikhonov also owes much to this land. Working as an editor of the *Sovietski vostok* (The Soviet East) newspaper, A. Fadeev got to know the multinational North Caucasus well, which was one of the reasons for his above-mentioned report on Kosta Khetagurov. Founder of Soviet Chuvash literature, M. Sespel is known to have lived for some time

in Ukraine, and he translated Taras Shevchenko's *Kobzar*. The prominent Soviet Armenian prose writer A. Bakunts studied in Kharkiv and thus his closeness to the life and culture of the Ukrainian people influenced his creative works. The outstanding Tatar poet, prose writer and playwright Akhmed Faizi taught at Turkmenian schools in the 1920s; the rising Chuvash poet P. Khuzangai worked in Kazakhstan in 1926—1927, then in Uzbekistan, and after a trip to Azerbaijan wrote the poem, *The Twenty-Six,* which marked his turning to revolutionary themes; many Tatar and Bashkir literati also lived and worked in Kazakhstan.

Present in these writings are profound influences of the most distinguished writers of one or another nation on other national literatures or on their men of letters, as well as influences and mutual influences along ideological, thematic, genre, formal-aesthetical and other lines. Under our conditions, such mutual influences are not only bilateral, but also multilateral. The role of Russian literature, espicially that played by works of M. Gorky and V. Mayakovsky in the development of other Soviet national literatures, including Ukrainian, is well known. Add to this the influence of M. Sholokhov and A. Fadeev on the progress of Soviet prose, etc.

Soviet literature, in fact, did not develop without being influenced by its other national counterparts and by other national realities and folkways. Thus, deep impressions from Ukrainian life, its environment and folklore, as well as an acquaintance with Ukrainian classical literature, are traced in the writings of N. Gogol, A. Serafimovich, V. Katayev, Ye. Bagritsky, A. Fadeev *(The Young Guard),* etc. A number of Soviet Russian men of letters were influenced by other national literatures: N. Tikhonov by Georgian poetry; V. Bryusov by Armenian verse, which he translated; and some wrote under the spell of other national folklore. P. Tychyna's creations didn't pass unnoticed by prose and screenplay writers Yu. Yanovsky and O. Dovzhenko. Tychyna's poetry, in fact, made quite an impact on all Soviet national literatures in general and on a number of Soviet poets in particular. As the Kazakh literary critic M. Duysenov put it, "Kazakh literature inherited the best traditions of such writers of the fraternal nations as Shevchenko, Bazhan, Korniychuk, Rylsky, Tukai, Aini, M. Ibra-

gimov, Gulam and many others." Kazakh literature, on its part — primarily through the creativity of M. Auezov — influenced other literatures of the Soviet East. Generally speaking, there are traditional and varied contacts maintained among Tatar, Kazakh, Bashkir, Uzbek, Kirghiz, Turkmenian, Tajik and the Altai Mountain (Oyrot) literatures (since they all, except for Tajik, belong to the Turkic subfamily of languages; as regards the Tajiks, they have been neighbors so long of the Uzbeks, resulting in such fruitful contacts, that, for example, the Tajik classic Sadriddin Aini wrote also in Uzbek and was one of the founders of Soviet Uzbek literature.

Present in these writings is the influence of the inner image of a poet or writer and impressions from his personal and creative virtues. In this sense, one finds a great variety of names, all of them distinguished, names like Maxim Gorky, Vladimir Mayakovsky, Nikolai Ostrovsky, Alexander Fadeev, Sadriddin Aini, Khamza Khakim-zade, Niyazi, Seken Seifullin, Musah Jalil, Arkadiy Gaidar, the titan worker Andrei Upits, Vilis Lacis, Samed Vurgun, Johann Smuul, Rasul Gamzatov, Olexander Dovzhenko and Pavlo Tychyna. Not only through their creations, but also as personalities they acquire a certain degree of importance for all the nations living in the Soviet Union. To Soviet people of every nationality, their names symbolize things of great ethical value that are near and dear to one and all.

Present in these writings are the innermost mutual influences of neighboring nations, plus the reciprocal penetration of cultural elements into traditionally formed or long-existent national communities, elements which were "imported" during the migration of peoples, as well as all that wide and continuously expanding torrent of cultural exchanges, the mutual acquaintance of nations and rapprochement of their "souls..."

It is, of course, quite possible that some, or perhaps many of the factors that are now in effect throughout the world, operated in a certain way in previous cultural epochs. So how can they be approached as being "specifically socialist?"

Yes, these factors operated before and are effective at present, too, but their current Soviet scope and ideological content are a far cry from those used in other epochs and

different media, the more so that they operated by and large counter to the trends and policies of the ruling classes — anyway, they were not facilitated by the state, as such, which either ignored them or treated them in a hostile way. That's one thing. Another thing is that they operated previously, and still do, outside the socialist community, sporadically, spontaneously and "individually," being in most cases inherent in separate creative biographies and only slowly, little by little and indirectly revealing their more general essence.

Hence the new, specific socialist nature of these factors in our society: their being typical for our spiritual life, their "mass" character and "mutual support," their purposeful and joint effects, their effective formation into a mighty resultant force which is directed toward the development and maturity of the Soviet people's internationalist culture.

The Soviet nations' reciprocal mastering of their cultural heritages and turning them into a common gain of the entire Soviet people is one of the best channels through which the wealth and traditions of national cultures flow into the Soviet people's international culture. An immeasurable plentitude of values are thus stored in the treasury of this international culture, plus the rich folk epos of the Soviet nations and all their national poetic, musical and artistic heritages and the best folk traditions in every sphere of culture. Preserved here are also the treasures of classical literatures and the arts of nations with age-old cultural histories, alongside the boundlessly diversified modern creations of dozens of large and small peoples.

Let us try to visualize the scope of reciprocal translations of national literatures (according to UNESCO, the Soviet Union ranks first in the world in the number of its literary translations into the languages of its constituent nations), the scope of this reciprocal reading, knowledge and interaction — not only of literatures, but also of the nations themselves through their literatures; the scope of research in the spheres of the history, ethnography, material and spiritual culture of all the peoples within the USSR (such studies are carried out both at the all-Union level and at research institutions in every single republic, the scholars concentrating not only on their respective

nations, but also on other Soviet peoples); and the scope of the scientific data obtained along these lines both at central and local research centers.

The historical and geographic range, the typological capacity and the factual saturation of the notion of cultural heritage — the domestic cultural heritage of Soviet man — have been, and still are, expanding.

If we take any grade school or university textbook, any popular or academic books on the history of culture, philosophy, sociology, or literature, if we leaf through any theoretical works or scientific surveys (no matter in which republic they were written and published), we shall find out that not one single author has failed to mention, or in his findings could do without the names of the great Russian litterateurs, prominent thinkers and progressive artistic personalities of all the other Soviet nations; Avicenna, Ulugbek, Donelaitis, Skovoroda, Shevchenko, Franko, Chavchavadze, Nalbandyan, and many others, who are the pride of their respective nations and our common pride. The fact that all these names are to be found in any literary survey is not a routine courtesy, but a due tribute ensuing from a comprehensive analysis of their singular contributions to all-human thought, and a steady, planned investigation involving the achievements of different nations and the literary treasures left by their brilliant minds and incorporated within a general gigantic picture of the progress of the human spirit in all the inexhaustible versatility of its manifestations.

We must add to this that the spiritual world and scope of modern Soviet society in general, and of every single Soviet nation in particular, are today unthinkable without *The Lay of the Host of Igor* and *The Knight in the Tiger's Skin,* without Alexander Pushkin, Taras Shevchenko, Janis Rainis, Yanka Kupala, Gyandzhevi Nizami, Alisher Navoi, Illya Chavchavadze, Khachatur Abovian, Andrei Upits, Leonid Leonov, Olexander Dovzhenko, Vilis Lacis, Samed Vurgun, August Jakobson, Rasul Gamzatov, Kaisin Kuliev, Mukhtar Auezov, Chinghiz Aitmatov, Vladimir Mayakovsky, Pavlo Tychyna, Alexander Fadeev and Oles Honchar. All these sons of different nations belong to our common culture, and some of their larger or smaller creative works are foundation stones in the edifice of the spirit of present-day Soviet man, endowing it with an awareness of the

multinationality of our heritage and profound socialist homogeneity.

Once we visualize this in its full scope, think it over and understand it, we shall be able to perceive the entire grandeur of the nations' "mutual penetration," of the great historic and cultural width of the foundation upon which rests the Soviet people's internationalist culture. We shall see the profundity of the Soviet spirit, we shall also be able to discern the world and the historic humanistic character of this great and continuous socialist cultural process and all its possible future consequences for the spiritual growth of humanity, and for preserving and accumulating the gains of all the phases of this process.

How wide of the mark and miserable in the light of all this are the allegations of bourgeois propaganda that the watchword of single multinational and international Soviet culture is only a camouflage concealing the process of Soviet culture's squeezing out other national cultures! There are also cautious voices heard of those asking doubtfully: isn't this international Soviet culture built on a somewhat too narrow basis (meaning that this basis is by and large made of Russian material)?

Certainly not. International Soviet culture is definitely not an ideological consecration of the cultural expansion of one nation, neither is it a conglomeration of popular excerpts taken from all national cultures, nor a "plebeian" jumble made up of these cultures. It is a capacious and ramified structure, a complex aggregate, a joint and purposeful cooperation among many different cultures. Such cooperation develops, from within the highest level of regularities common to all national cultures (and not imposed on them from without), the regularities of the development of the Soviet people's single international culture.

From the standpoint of history, essentially new scopes and character of cultural exchanges among nations have been achieved in multinational Soviet society, as well as principally new rates of speed in introducing cultural "novelties" and the artistic discoveries of separate nations into the cultural and spiritual life of all the other nations. As a matter of fact, any noticeable cultural phenomenon that has occurred in any republic or within any nation becomes soon a general gain, if not in the sense of its popularity than at least in the sense of its internal-cultural im-

portance, especially if the phenomenon in question reflects something qualitatively new in our life. These new, international and communist elements "sprout" simultaneously within all the socialist nations and must be adequately expressed aesthetically, and the nation which the first responds to this need and portrays these new elements artistically finds itself in what-one-might-call the lead of the art movement, and on the heights of a certain trend in the whole internationalist culture of the Soviet people.

Quite a few national literary and artistic phenomena could be mentioned to this end. In a way, these phenomena represent certain moments in the general Soviet cultural development which testify that the coordination of this development was increasing in all national cultures and that there were "breakthroughs" in various national "sections" and that all Soviet literature and the arts very quickly "pushed" through the openings, each national "detachment" gaining a new cultural height and bequeathing it for the benefit of all.

The aforementioned provides plenty of food for thought. First of all, about the high level of community reached by our national cultures and the way our nations live a united life, when people of various nations, reading what has been written by authors of other nations, find an expression there of not only their own ideals, but also of the finest aspirations of their souls, and of the completeness of their life. When they find portrayals of their own images in such literary creations, the latter become their own inner voice. When every national literature can speak on behalf of all other nations and when the writer can speak for all his counterparts, then he can make his national voice the voice of the entire country.

Hence the conclusion that this high degree of homogeneity, this all-Union representation of each national culture, and its inward adjustment to the all-Union scope do not deprive this culture of its national colors; an artist does not cease being national, neither does he lose the national character of his creativity (on the contrary, he gains more of it), but becomes a mouthpiece of the spirituality and ideology of all our multinational society.

This is only natural. The "secret" of an artist's or writer's success is not in the formal national content of his creativity, but in his adherence to the realism of life and to

progressive social and class ideals, in his ability to permeate himself with the deepest thoughts and aspirations of his people, to see the world through the eyes of his nation.

The history of world literature and the arts proves that the artists most national in spirit are not those who specially adjust themselves to everything markedly national and who reveal more purposefully borrowed "national features" and an outward "national peculiarity" (although they do make inevitable and valuable discoveries in their national artistic spheres), but are those who succeed in achieving a deeper insight into the life of the people, who uncover in their respective nations generally important and generally human elements and who, in writing about their people, write about all mankind.

The formal national trends in literature and the arts at best boil down to more or less successfully juggling with "national colors" within a comparatively limited sphere; and at worst, it leads to conservatism, narrowness, and estrangement from reality and from modern national life in its substantial manifestations.

Genuinely fruitful national elements in literature and the arts are always achieved through a deep understanding and skilled illustration of a true picture of the people's life from the standpoint of tendencies of historical development and with due regard to the vital interests of the working masses. It means that the litterateur's being national is always linked in some way with his progressive ideological stand.

Socialist Realism is unthinkable without a firm and deep ground of national artistic traditions and their substantial development. Still, not all of these traditions have equal perspectives in the socialist national arts, just as the latter does not accept all of them with equal enthusiasm. What is considered to be valuable in this sense is, first and foremost, those traditions which ensure a deep artistic insight into the life and work of the people and which can facilitate their steady progress. There are also certain archaic traditions associated with the times of hopeless patriarchy and national isolation; therefore, such traditions are rejected and overcome in the socialist national arts.

A socialist and Party understanding of national traditions in culture, and of the national ground of peoples'

cultures, particularly lies in the fact that national elements should be invariably approached as being firmly connected with international elements and as being dialectically developed into international forms.

This thesis with regard to poetry was well expressed in the meditations of the well-known Russian poet Mikhail Dudin on the collection of verse by his Balkar counterpart Kaisin Kuliev entitled *A Book of the Land:*

"A Book of the Land came out in the Balkar language and was based on the ground of songs and poems of the Balkar people. However, among the many magic qualities of true poetry there is one which is really astounding and which proves so essential in the course of modern history: all national merits of poetry never fail to enlarge its peak until it reaches the fraternity of the working people and until it penetrates into the very internationalist core of this fraternity."

Incidentally, the following phenomenon has become remarkably characteristic of our literary life: writers and poets of one nation often comment on the books and new works of their counterparts in other nations. Quite often the former become the original discoverers of new national literary and artistic greats, making them known throughout the Soviet Union. Thus Kaisin Kuliev "discovered" the Uzbek poet Abdulla Aripov for the Soviet reading public. A passionate article about the first unabridged Russian version of the memorable samples of the two great epics of ancient India, the *Ramayana* and the *Mahabharata,* belongs to the Kalmyk poet David Kugultinov. Similar "interference" into the national affairs of other peoples are not only to be found in the sphere of culture.

In our country, men of letters of all nations take all events close to their heart, events whether sad or gay, in the life of other nations, because this is our common life and we all share our joys and sorrows. For example, the general public in Armenia are now debating the question of what will be the future of Lake Sevan, and one of the most exciting feature stories about this lake was written by the Latvian poet Maris Chaklais who dearly loves Armenia and its culture: "You are going to Armenia for the fourth time? What have you lost there, or do you think you'll find something new? Do you remember what Rockwell Kent said? If you asked me, he said, where one could

see the greatest wonders on our planet, I'd say in Armenia in the first place..." Maris Chaklais first took a keen interest in the creativities of the Soviet Armenian poet Paruir Sevak and became his ardent popularizer. An interesting detail: Paruir Sevak's poetry was translated into Latvian and was published with a circulation of 50,000 copies, and yet the book very quickly became a bibliographic rarity. So that you understand what this means, let us make a comparison: in Denmark, one of the most culturally developed Western countries whose population is three times the population of Soviet Latvia, the average circulation of a novel — note: a novel, and not a book of verse!— is 3,000 copies and that of a best-seller 20,000-30,000.

The richness of national cultures and literatures in our society multiply their strength and potentialities. Each of them can, and does rely not only on its own attainments, but also on the gains of its other national counterparts. Add to this that ever broader masses in every nation benefit more and more from the achievements of both their own and other national cultures. All this strengthens the spiritual potential of a nation and thus facilitates its own creative endeavors which are then realized in its national culture.

The richness and versatility of national cultures ensure the completeness and versatility of the spiritual self-knowledge of a socialist society. As a result, not one section of its historical road, not one of its continuously changing forms, and not a single national aspect are forgotten, they all remain in the upper compartment of the joint aesthetical memory of society; this memory absorbs all the inexhaustibility of everything that is "scattered" and "jumbled" in time and space, pigeonholes it and develops from it a single panoramic view of our life, adding to society's self-understanding and enabling it to improve itself in a rational manner. Finally, this cultural plurality gives Soviet man what so far remains impregnable and has never yet been experienced by other social systems — the richness and veriety of aesthetical images of the world, making him the sole inheritor of so many national heritages (an unprecendented advantage indeed!) and providing him with the opportunity of reaching such cultural many-sidedness which previously could only be dreamed of.

Soviet Ukrainian Culture on the Road to Prosperity

An important place in the treasury of our common multinational cultural wealth and in the spiritual security of the Soviet people's social development also belongs to Ukrainian national culture which under socialism has reached unprecedented heights of progress.

It is common knowledge that proir to the revolution the Ukrainian people had no opportunity for normal development as a cultured and civilized nation. Several centuries of tsarist colonial policies brought about a decline of education and culture, almost universal illiteracy and national demoralization. The high traditional level of folk-craft and artistic culture was still maintained, but the Ukraine's colonial position hindered the process of folk culture's growing into a modern general national culture and doomed the latter to gradual degradation to the level of ethnographical obsoleteness.

The tsarist administration took every step to prevent the emergence of a versatile professional level of culture in the Ukraine and to suppress the growth of Ukrainian literature, theater, music, book printing and the press, so as to make the creations of Ukrainian national litterateurs inaccessible to the people. A. Ukrainian national intelligentsia as a social force did not exist, therefore gifted Ukrainian men of science and art, numerous as they were, had to live elsewhere to find an outlet for their abilities. The Ukrainian language was prohibited at grade schools and was not to be used in writing. It was not recognized by reactionary and retrograde elements who proclaimed Ukrainian a non-existent tongue or reduced it to a dialect, a "domestic language," a tongue to be used at home only.

There was no material, technological, professional, personnel or organizational base for the development of Ukrainian national culture. Instead, everything was done to eliminate the slightest possibility of such a base. Certainly, even in those circumstances, the Ukrainian people did give the world quite a few prominent figures in various spheres of culture, science, literature and the arts. But how many more of them there would be if the situation had been different!

All this has to be taken into account in order to properly estimate what the Ukrainian people have achieved in the sphere of their national culture following the Great October Revolution.

Some people, however, seem to forget about this and they do not see "anything special" in what we have today, as if all these benefits were always there, granted us miraculously like manna, or as if they were some natural "living wage" resulting from mere historical tradition, and not gained as a result of the people's revolutionary struggle and their socialist reality and labor endeavors shared with the Russian and the other fraternal nations of our Motherland.

Still others simply choose to ignore it, because if they didn't, then all their talk about the allegedly miserable lot of Ukrainian national culture would be based on extremely unfavorable — for them — historical grounds. That is why they feel so reluctant to make any factual comparisons "with the year 1913" and are trying to counterpoise them with trifling ironic remarks like, "They've found something to compare with!" These people don't want to realize what a long and historically significant road the Ukrainian people have travelled within the last several decades.

In the course of the Great October Socialist Revolution the Ukrainian people started along the historical road which led them to their social and national emancipation by becoming a socialist nation, and to an active participation in building a multinational Soviet communist society.

Moving along this road, the people became complete masters of all treasures of their culture and free creators of its new, socialist form. Their creative energy, now freed, surged forward in all spheres of social and cultural activities. The labor masses, the workers, peasants, Red Army men and their children, this multimillion mass, set in to

learn at schools and develop social literacy. The working people were students and masters at the same time. Born of their flesh, there appeared poets, writers, artists and scholars. The working people's state took into its creative hands the task of purposefully developing its national cultures.

The spiritual culture of a modern nation is not only a literary and artistic phenomenon, and it is created not only within artistic media. Its major element is satisfying the spiritual needs and the demands of the popular masses and the latter's spiritual and social development.

We all know how much has been done, and is still being done, along these lines in our country whose material and cultural progress is only possible when this material and cultural progress is for the broadest popular masses; we also know that this progress, being generally socialist in character, has simultaneously been carried out, and this is still going on in every national republic on its respective national grounds and its respective national forms.

Wasn't this a great historical achievement — the liquidation of illiteracy — in its time considered to be a large-scale promulgation of nothing but national written languages, to carry out a colossal expansion on the base of national culture that would involve a millions-strong mass of people? Wasn't the gradual implementation of a massive public education program under socialism (a universal compulsory elementary schooling, later — a lower school secondary education, and now, practically a complete switchover to a general complete high school education) a further historical deepening of this process?

This is, of course, a social phenomenon whose content is extremely extensive: it does not equate a development of national culture, and it far exceeds the latter's boundaries. But let us now try to figure out what this phenomenon means specifically for national culture.

It means broadening beyond comparison the spiritual horizons of the people and their spiritual potentialities — hence the deepening of the sources of national culture itself, the widening of "tributaries" feeding it; it also means an unheard-of expansion of the national culture's "home marker," broadening the spheres and increasing the intensiveness of its "consumption" — hence the impetuously growing interest and demand and social and

aesthetical "requirements" where national culture is concerned, which, in turn, stimulate its further advancement.

When the whole nation, and not separate individuals or one or another social group, gains literacy, when the school knowledge, book, lectures and various special school programs penetrate deep into the nation's life — only then can essential changes be guaranteed within the structure of national culture and provide a tremendous impact on its character and the degree of its influence upon the entire life of the people.

Prior to the revolution, Ukrainian national culture actually existed, in so far as the bulk of the people were concerned, only in its folk everyday life forms. Its enormous historical heritage, as well as its professional-level literary and artistic creations, classical objets d'art included, were known and available only to a small number of individuals (one exception probably being Taras Shevchenko's writnigs which quickly became popular with the people, but even they reached the people in a far from complete form).

Even today, most of the population in exploiting societies, and throughout the entire bourgeois world, have not the slightest idea about the real treasures of their national cultures. These treasures are inaccessible to them notwithstanding the formal literacy and civilization of their respective media. Even their best national litterateurs do not exist for them, which fact has more than once been mentioned with bitterness by progressive cultural figures of the West.

An altogether different picture is to be seen in a socialist society in general, and specifically in Soviet Ukraine. Present-day Ukrainian generations are made up of millions of people who learned standard Ukrainian at school, studied Ukrainian History and Georgaphy there, read Taras Shevchenko, Ivan Franko, Vasyl Stefanyk, Mikhailo Kotsyubynsky, Lesya Ukrainka, Olga Kobylyanska, Yanovsky, Holovko, Tychyna, Rylsky, Sosyura, Bazhan, Dovzhenko, Honchar and many other creators of their national literature. They also studied the Russian language and literature, USSR and World History and Geography, they read Pushkin, Lermontov, Gogol, Tolstoy, Gorky, Mayakovsky, Sholokhov and Fadeev. They are familiar with the best representatives of other fraternal literatures — those like

Rustaveli, Nizami, Rainis, Khetagurov, Stalsky and Jambul Jabaev. Isn't this a significant fact in determining the people's cultural standards, their spiritual capacities and the fate of their own national culture?

Of no less importance in this sense is the tempestuous development and continuous expansion of higher schooling. The doors of colleges and universities are open wide before hundreds of thousands of young Ukrainian men and women. All they have to do is enter them and then — on to science and receiving the highest qualifications in all spheres of the national economy and social endeavors, material and cultural production. These hundreds of thousands (millions, if one takes into account the last few decades) of people are not an isolated cast, but part (and a large one at that) of the nation and a growing component of its historical existence. From the standpoint of history it is indeed a tremendous addition to the spiritual potential of national culture!

Given below are statistics characterizing the present-day world educational standards of our people: * "Studying presently in grades 5 to 10 in Ukraine are 30 times as many students as in 1914; 31 times as many as prior to the revolution are now enrolled in the country's higher schools — of which there are close to 1,000. More than half the employed population have a higher or secondary (high school) education; 2,500,000 specialists are involved in the national economy, which is 13 times more than in all of Russia before the revolution. There are 74 engineers per 10,000 residents (compared with 38 in the USSR), and more than 14,300,000 are studying at specialized secondary educational establishments and other institutions of learning — almost one-third of the Republic's population."

And what about the high level of scientific progress and the continuously expanding network of research centers and the growing scope of scientific findings! Let us just try to imagine how much all this strengthens, so to say, the structure of the nation's intellectual resources as a whole, how fast it is raising the Ukrainian people, together with all the other Soviet nations, to leading positions in world progress, increasing their contribution to mankind's

* I borrowed them from the book *The International and the National in a Socialist Society,* published in Kiev, 1973, in Ukrainian — **I.D.**

joint efforts in mastering the forces of nature! At the same time, it shows them their own abilities, increases their knowledge of themselves and especially their knowledge about their own national culture (since there are special sciences in Ukraine dealing with various spheres of national culture — history, language, literature and the arts of the Ukrainian people — which are an important section of the advancement of science today).

These large-scale and advanced educational processes and scientific activities are accompanied by the substantial production of popular, study and specialized literature embracing different fields of knowledge. A great part of this literature has been, and is still, published in Ukrainian. It is hard to overestimate the importance of this factor for the status and progress of national culture both in its broader meaning (its contribution to the joint intellectual "capital" and to the spiritual gains of the nation and the opening of new horizons for social and spiritual advancement), and in its narrower meaning (its influence on the population's cultural standards, on their interests and on their knowledge of their national culture, as well as its impact on the ideological, thematical and professional level of literature and the arts, on strengthening and developing the national language and on the sphere of its functioning).

Mass media — the press, radio, motion pictures and television, thanks to which tens of millions of people feel as if they have direct contacts with the powerful currents of ideological, political, social, literary and artistic life — occupy a highly important place in the structure of modern national culture.

Apart from the all-Union Russian-language agencies and sources of mass information, powerful mass media also functions in Ukraine (the Republican press, radio and television) which basically employs the Ukrainian language. They constantly provide millions of people with a national, Ukrainian-language "image" of the world and of Soviet life, which is the result of not only the steady practice of using Ukrainian, but also of national self-assertion in general. It is another manifestation of our involvement in (and being part of) the life of all of the Land of Soviets through the life of our nation. Both the traditional wealth and the new achievements of Ukrainian culture (and, simultaneously, those of the other Soviet nations, and of

the entire Soviet people's international culture) are made quickly known and available by the mass media to all people in Ukraine.

Under socialism, the broad popular masses have been granted access to the treasures of national culture (and not only their own). What is more, they are being directly involved in the process of their creation — both through the growing influx of gifted personalities (coming from ever increasing social groups) into the sphere of professional art which has long ceased to be a caste-closed medium, and through the stepping up of those social and cultural phenomena bearing the somewhat hackneyed appellation of "amateur art activities."

The latter have, in fact, become so massive here and have reached such ideological and aesthetic levels that they have long outgrown their original purpose as a means of public entertainment — or "organized leisure time," * as it is called here — and have become a tangible factor in public and artistic endeavors for millions of people, for their aesthetic self-education in the process of actively mastering one or another art form; they have also become one expression of the nationwide creation of national culture.

During Soviet times, the Ukrainian people, like the other Soviet fraternal nations, have therefore become one of the most educated and cultured of nations, in its truest meaning. The further progress of Ukraine along these lines is ensured in all respects, both through the Communist Party's social and cultural policies and by means of a powerful material and technological base in the form of the necessary financial allocations and a ramified network of educational and scientific establishments, cultural institutions, professional and amateur artistic groups, the press dealing with culture and the arts, administrational and public associations, unions of the arts, and the like. All this is a modern "industry" of national culture in operation; its productive process is objective and irreversible.

Nowadays, the Ukrainian people have at their disposal all kinds of art and all spheres of culture natural to a

---

* **Copy Editor's note:** in the English sense: hobby groups or workshops.

modern nation. Soviet Ukraine's opera, ballet, choreography, and vocal-choral art have won world acclaim. Ukrainian singers and dancers and artistic groups have been, and are still demonstrating the Soviet arts in many foreign countries, and with invariable success.

Ukrainian theaters whose audiences number millions of people successfully stage the classic works of both Soviet and world dramaturgy, as well as those by Soviet Ukrainian playwrights and their counterparts from the other fraternal republics. The latter's theatrical companies, in turn, often dramatize the creations of Soviet Ukrainian litterateurs who have long won nationwide recognition thanks to I. Kocherha, M. Irchan, I. Mykytenko, O. Korniychuk, and others. Currently, Soviet Ukrainian dramaturgy highlights the works of such popular playwrights as M. Zarudny and O. Kolomiyets, also plays by M. Stelmakh, L. Dmyterko, V. Sobko and others.

Ukrainian cinematography has given the world one of the most outstanding creators of world film-making — Olexander Dovzhenko, whose mighty and inspiring influence was felt everywhere and whose teaching finds growing adherence among cinema specialists all over the globe.

Thus, the Italians K. Lidsani and M. Mida wrote: "It is established now that Dovzhenko's lessons, well learned as they were, left a deep imprint upon the most significant and exciting creations of Italian Neo-Realism — first and foremost, in works by Rossellini and others." The well-known French cinematography historian G. Sadoul considers O. Dovzhenko to be one of the most prominent figures in world film-making, alongside S. Esenstein and Vsev. Pudovkin, and Chairlie Chaplin called the Ukrainian film director the greatest man of the cinema ever born in the Slavic world. L. Moussinac, R. Manetti, L. Lingart and H. Santov were of the same opinion.

Ukrainian cinematography can also boast such well-known names as I. Savchenko, H. Chukhrai, S. Bondarchuk and many others. And today, quite a number of eminent creative personalities here are also working in this field.

Both earlier and current achievements in the Ukrainian pictorial and the graphic and plastic arts are also widely acclaimed, especially those associated with the names of

H. Narbut, O. Murashko, F. Krychevsky, A. Manastyrsky, K. Trokhimenko, O. Novakivsky, M. Samokysh, A. Petrytsky, O. Shovkunenko, V. Kasiyan, T. Yablonska, F. Manaylo, H. Yakutovych, M. Derehus, H. Kalchenko, O. Danchenko, V. Borodai, and many others.

The exhibitions and art shows of folk craftsmen have been, and still are a great success, because they open to the general public wonderworlds of form and color such as those created by Maria Pryimachenko, Kateryna Bilokur, Hanna Vasylashchuk, Hanna Veres, Lyzaveta Myronova, Hanna Sobachko, Omelyan Zheleznyak and Ivan Shostak.

Among the interesting events of our artistic life there are also the shows of young painters, graphic artists and sculptors.

Works by the prominent Ukrainian painters V. Kasiyan, T. Yablonska, H. Yakutovych, F. Manaylo and others can serve as examples of the links between the essentially national character of modern Ukrainian art and its general-Soviet importance and effects, as well as of the vitality of national folk traditions, which is one of the reasons for the contemporary attainments of modern Ukrainian culture.

Take, for example, Tetyana Yablonska whose creative talent is acclaimed both within our country and far beyond its borders — wherever her convases were exhibited. She was so fortunate as to successfully portray with remarkable profundity and expressiveness the atmosphere of Soviet reality, the spiritual and emotional world of the image of Soviet man, and to convey the fundamental social and ethical dimensions of our life. Throughout all her creative search the artist again and again reaffirms the deeply national quality of her creations, and many times over returns to folk artistic traditions.

"I'm enchanted by the sublimity of a mother of ten children, I'm bewitched by the beauty of Carpathian lumberjacks, I find myself constantly amazed and deeply impressed by people's everyday life," says Yablonska, "come, visit any home, and you'll find embroidered clothes, towels and carpets everywhere. I simply cannot remain indifferent, seeing all this. I love folk craftsmanship with its palette of colors and remarkable expressiveness. I can stand for hours in front of canvases by Hanna Sobachko and Maria Pryimachenko, just as I stand for

hours admiring the needlework on the embroidered towels of Hanna Vasylashchuk and Hanna Veres."

Soviet Ukrainian musical art has every right to be proud of classical pieces by M. Leontovych, Ya. Stepovy, F. Kolessa, K. Stetsenko, V. Kosenko, M. Verykivsky, L. Revutsky, S. Lyudkevych and B. Lyatoshynsky.

Soviet Ukrainian composers are actively elaborating all modern musical genres, creating new operas and ballets, writing symphonies, concert and chamber music. Apart from the well-known representatives of the older generation — A. Shtoharenko, K. Dankevych, H. Zhukovsky, Yu. Meitus, A. Kos-Anatolsky, V. Homolyaka, A. Fylypenko, H. Taranov, H. Maiboroda and P. Maiboroda, we also now have a group of young talented composers — like V. Hubarenko, V. Kyreyko, L. Kolodub, M. Skoryk, and so on.

Ukraine's modern musical art knows quite a number of distinguished performers and groups including prominent conductors, violinists, pianists and first-class orchestras and ensembles — particularly the State Symphony Orchestra of the Ukrainian SSR, the Ukrainian Radio and Television Orchestra, the one at Kiev's Opera and Ballet Theater, the Kiev Chamber Orchestra, the Mykola Lysenko Quartet, the Lviv Opera House Orchestra, and so on.

I'm not giving a list here of the great many professional and amateur choirs, variety orchestras, dance-choreographic ensembles and other artistic groups that are to be found in all regions of Ukraine. Many of them are known throughout the Soviet Union and successfully represent Ukrainian art on the all-Union and world stage.

Below are only a few facts and examples, though I could provide many more.

The Veselka Amateur Folk Song and Dance Ensemble of the Zastavniv House of Culture (Chernihiv Region) was awarded the Grand Prix at the 1973 Cervona Ruza Festival of Folk Ensembles in Yugoslavia for the performance of Bukovinian folk songs and dances.

The Cheremosh Amateur Vocal Choreographic Ensemble from Lviv University was awarded the Gold Medal at the Republican Amateur Art Festival held on the occasion of the USSR's 50-year jubilee.

The Ukrainian Folk Instrumental Orchestra from Lviv's Palace of Young Pioneers received the First Degree Diploma at that same Festival and, later, made successful

appearances at the Druzhba (Friendship) Concert in Yerevan and during the 10th World Youth Festival in Berlin.

Thousands of people in many Soviet cities and abroad gave standing ovations to the well-known Chervona Ruta (Red Rue) Ensemble from the Donetsk Philharmonic Society starring its soloist and Merited Artist of the Ukrainian SSR Sophia Rotaru...

It is simply impossible today to keep track of how many amateur ensembles, choirs, folk theaters, folk Universities of Culture and folk museums have been formed in Ukraine...

If one tries to visualize the gigantic and many-colored picture of Ukraine's present-day cultural and artistic life, if one tries to imagine how many efforts have been made, how much work has been done, what loving care, selfless dedication and love for the arts and for Ukrainian culture have been displayed to make this picture a reality, how many gifted personalities have contributed to it and how many artists' lives are linked with it and creative energies spent on it — then he will see the great scope of the people's spiritual self-revelation. Modern Soviet Ukrainian culture and the arts are mature today, and a part of the socialist nation, and do not have to borrow creative forces to serve their people to the utmost, they are full of vigor and have great prospects. Such would be the major conclusion one would arrive at upon examining this picture.

Of course, like any other nation, the Ukrainian people have their own problems, difficulties, gaps to be filled in and weak points in their modern national arts; some artistic spheres are developing quicker, others slower, some have estabished firm ground and traditions, others are only putting down their first roots; some are in blossom, crowned with the names of talented artists and rising stars, others are still in the bud; lastly, not everywhere or always are the arts adequately popularized and all their resources used.

But this is a subject for different, specially problematic, and critical surveys which have nothing to do with the "principal" denial of the soundness and vitality of Ukrainian national socialist culture, just as they have nothing to do with doubts in this culture's prospects and its future national-social security — they have nothing in common with that "deep concern" and "anxiety" which bourgeois

nationalist propaganda is trying to impose on us from overseas.

As I said before, in considering all this one has to bear in mind that Ukrainian socialist culture does not exist as something separate. It is part of all Soviet culture, it is "surrounded" with other national cultures, and these "surroundings" are not only territory, but also cultural values. Practically any Ukrainian reader, listener or spectator receives into his sphere of cultural self-consciousness and outlook not only the facts of Ukrainian culture, but also those of Russian, Byelorussian, Georgian, Armenian, Lithuanian and other cultures. All this creates an essentially new situation with new factors and regularities unknown in a "one-culture" situation in which this culture is isolated from others.

First of all, such a situation is very beneficial, highly humanistic as far as the "consumer" of culture is concerned. It widens to an unprecedented extent the cricle of cultural factors accessible to the "consumer," as well as his possibilities of choice, and lessens his dependence, the dependence of his spiritual diapason on the scale of a one-nation culture. To a certain extent this complicates the situation of one or another national culture which may thus lose some of its audience and social interest: this audience would turn to cultures of "greater prestige" which, although it would be an undesirable situation, could be kept to the minimum on the one hand through cultural-educational work and intensified popularization of national art on a countrywide scale, and on the other — by raising the level of all branches of the national culture and by activating its aesthetic "advance" on the consumer.

Creative "competition" between national cultures is becoming one of the stimulants for their development. But the main thing is that the socialist national cultures, developing as a single whole in the international culture of the Soviet people, are mutually bound, mutually dependent and yet they ensure themselves of being on an approximately equal level. They have common criteria and a common potential, so that the successes of individual cultures promote a general cultural "front." Their progress is increasingly regarded as being composite.

The most graphic example of this is fiction, which is the most socially sensitive and dynamic sphere of national

culture, and having as well the largest plane of intellectual contacts with international cultural media and the largest inter-national "mobility."

The prominent Ukrainian writer Yuri Smolych stated, "We would have been spiritually poorer and our search less fruitful if we did not have the creations of Gorky, Mayakovsky, Sholokhov, Tvardovsky... I think that the very atmosphere of our life, the fraternal cooperation between the peoples, helps the ever more profound and thorough discovery of the creative potential of each nation, Ukrainian included."

Soviet fiction has long been developing as a single whole based on common communist ideals, a general method of Socialist Realism, a common striving to artistically portray the historical-social creations of the revolutionary people and the epochal image of the new socialist man. But such homogeneity by no means injures the national status of literatures, nor does it deprive them of their national originality, nor set them on the downward path. On the contrary, it gives them wider historical horizons, new sources of emotions, more social and historical spatiality inseparably linking them to greater ideological and political values and to internationalist revolutionary experience.

These new potentialities of national literatures reflect the new objectively historical position of nations, the content and importance of their socialist life.

Speaking at the international writers' congress for the promotion of culture held in Paris in 1935, Yakub Kolas said, "While genres of Byelorussian literature were previously restricted to songs, fairy tales or historical poems, under Soviet times we have created and are creating heroic lyrics, epic poems, novels and dramas.

"Before, the thoughts of our writers were locked within a narrow circle of national and nationalistic themes, but now the writers of Soviet Byelorussia have discarded these themes and widely extended the horizons of their creative endeavors, focusing their attention on questions of socialist construction, on the struggle against the class enemy, and on international proletarian solidarity."

Of great importance is also the fact that the readership of a national writer in the Soviet Union has radically changed because of the tremendous scope of reciprocal translations and their efficiency. In this connection, I

would like to quote the Armenian writer Eduard Topchayan, a representative of an ancient and rich literature that will never die:

"Classical Armenian literature was mainly a literature for those who could read Armenian, its works were seldom translated into Russian or foreign languages. Today we live and create in the atmosphere of great Soviet literature and the progressive literature of all the world, and our works are read by tens of millions of people.

"Our books, translated into Russian, as well as into the languages of the USSR nations and foreign languages, are crossing the boundaries of our national culture and thus rank among the best works of present-day literature."

This undobtedly sets before the writer new responsibilities, makes him think in terms of new criteria, and it is not by chance that Topchayan's compatriot Paruir Sevak, the talented writer already mentioned above, emphasizes:

"...The national writer who doesn't elevate his nation's biography to a world level cannot earn international recognition."

Of course we do not have in mind some artificial, forced "adaptation" of the facts and problems of national life to those of worldwide, global dimensions, but a revelation of its inner social, and social-historical content, of the objective significance of its experience and the life processes that are now taking place. The classical writer of Byelorussian literature, Kuzma Chorny, was perfectly right when he said that after the Great October Socialist Revolution the "national life of Byelorussians became a fact of international import"; this certainly refers quite as much to other once "non-historical" nations of former tsarist Russia.

The sphere of national literature has currently crossed national boundaries: it sees all the Soviet Union and lives her life; in ideological and aesthetic orientation is in line with that of the entire Soviet Union; and it is read throughout the Soviet Union. Let's take as an example the literatures of national minorities and literatures previously oral because they lacked a written language and seemed doomed to a gradual decline. Could these literatures — without that all-Union, so to say, spiritual resonator and amplifier — have produced works of a higher standard and social significance, works which reflect the principal

moral problems of the present day or the basic features of Soviet man's world outlook, such as the philosophic poems and fairy tales by the Kalmyk David Kugultinov, *Pagan Poem* by the Mansi Yuvan Shestalov, poetry by the Balkar Kaisin Kuliev and the Avar Rasul Gamzatov, and the latter's famous *My Daghestan,* to mention but a few?

Urainian Soviet literature, thanks to its unbreakable links with the ideas of the Great October Revolution, thanks to the active participation of the Ukrainian people in the world historical process of creating a new life, has become the "joint-owner" of the ideas and experience of Soviet society, and one of the voices of the entire Soviet people. From the very start Ukrainian Soviet literature has spoken on behalf of all the Soviet people. It is not difficult to imagine to what extent this enhances its historical "authority," and widens its ideological and spiritual potentiality, as well as the scope of its ideological and image-bearing thinking.

It is on the same height of historical development as the other fraternal literatures having at its "disposal" all the ideological strength of socialist society, all its spiritual wealth. It shares all this in common with the other national literatures of the USSR. At the same time, Ukrainian Soviet literature presents all this through the prism of Ukrainian history, experience, and national character — in a specific Ukrainian presentation. In other words, the common features are enriched by a Ukrainian national and Ukrainian artistic "version" of world-historical problematic points. What a marvellous opportunity and great happiness for an artist who has reached this level and for whom it has become his creative reality!

Thus, Yuri Yanovsky in his novel *The Riders* created an inimitably perfect lyrical-epic image of the Great Revolution in the living flesh of national history and in the implacable rhythms of a 20th century folk ballad. Let us compare this image with those created by Alexander Serafimovich in *The Iron Torrent,* by Nikolai Ostrovsky in *How the Steel Was Tempered,* by Alexei Tolstoy in *The Road to Calvary,* by Mikhail Sholokhov in *And Quiet Flows the Don.* How much they have in common in epochal scope, sociopolitical essence and the regularities of class conflicts! And how different they are, how inimitable and flexible in content, in their spiritual and emotional over-

tones and in their national-historical aspect! They describe the very image of the revolution in Ukraine which passed through the crucible of a writer's "soul." And one cannot but agree that without Yuri Yanovsky's masterpiece which Louis Aragon compared with Homer's epic writings, the image of the Great October Revolution would have remained for future generations as essentially incomplete and insufficient, and certain implacably tragic, sternly pathetic and naively joyous colors would have been lost forever...

Olexander Dovzhenko, through the tragically pure pathos and the chaste and ecstatic lyricism of *The Earth,* through its merciless generalizations and monumental scope and at the same time its tender-hearted rhythmic flow gave the world a Ukrainian national image of collectivization, the deepest and most painful social break with the past after the October Revolution, a revolutionary rural transformation which was very acute in Ukraine and fitted specific historical prerequisites.

All the richness yet complexity of accepting the Revolution and socialist times by the Ukrainian intellectual, the deep socialist "reconstruction" of his "soul," its painful yet fruitful self-reconstruction on a world-revolutionary scale, its incessant, intimate adaptation to all spheres of social advancement were all "lived through" by Pavlo Tychyna and were crystallized in his writings. This picture of the formation and victorious consolidation of a new world was painfully lived through by the Ukrainian poet; it is his own inner spiritual panorama which produces such an image of the epoch, it reveals such a deep feeling, it is a picture that would never have seen the light if it weren't for Ukrainian Soviet literature.

Similarly, in the creations of every prominent Ukrainian Soviet writer, in every outstanding work of Ukrainian literature — from *Weeds* by Andriy Holovko to Oles Honchar's *The Standard-Bearers,* from *Whirlpool* by Hrihoriy Tyutyunnik to Mikhailo Stelmakh's *Truth and Falsehood,* from Ostap Vyshnya's unforgettable humorous stories to Stepan Oliynyk's naively-sly humorous verses written in the form of folk style — we find a general-Soviet historical scope; a general-Soviet evaluation of conflicts, problems, ideals; a general-Soviet ideological "impetus" which gives us deep ideological insight, an ideological and

image-bearing breadth of perception (simultaneously bearing the imprint of specific Ukrainian national features and of a deeply national quintessence); gives us concrete vitality and historical uniqueness, social and psychological convictions; and human values.

Without Ukrainian Soviet literature, the picture of socialist reality would have been incomplete and would have lost a lot of essential and inimitable features. If Ukrainian Soviet literature did not rest upon the life experience of all Soviet history, if it did not speak on behalf of all the Soviet people, and did not rest, for its development, upon the accomplishments of all Soviet writers, it would not have its present force and prestige, or its ideological and image-bearing significance and inspiration.

This also refers to contemporary, present-day Ukrainian literature, with the only probable amendment that its interaction with other national literatures has become even more direct. And it takes Soviet present-day life and Ukrainian reality — as a component part — as a subject for portrayal. Its hero is modern Soviet man and the modern Ukrainian as Soviet man. Its ideas and images, its sensitive and flexible contents proceed form the Ukrainian social, spiritual and emotional experience — which is simultaneously the Soviet social, spiritual and emotional experience.

The Ukrainian aspect here serves as a prism for perceiving general-Soviet life, and its significance is ensured by the entire scope of general-Soviet reality. At the same time this Ukrainian aspect means enriching general-Soviet reality with national experience and literary embodiments, while general-Soviet reality is absorbed into Ukrainian history.

In M. Bazhan's *Uman Reminiscences,* for example, we have, so to say, canonical general-Soviet motifs which have long occupied a firm place in the history of the self-consciousness of all our society and have been expressed in classic fiction; the peneration of Lenin's *Iskra* into this remote "province" and its revolutionizing influence on the latter; the austere romantic humanism of the revolution which during the ruthless class struggle found resources of spiritual purity for preserving "apolitical" monuments of art (revolution and beauty; the thirst for world transformation and beauty); the tragic drama of a socially dis-

orientated, "all at sea" person who though honest by nature and comes from the people, seeks his way through the whirlwind of the revolution; the search for a road leading to revolution.

This is all very well known in its general form and theoretical abstraction; just as it is well-known in various concrete artistic variations, for these are historically typical, and universally significant situations of that time. But in Bazhan's works these motifs are shown in such integral national, concrete form, in such Ukrainian social, spiritual and every-day-life material, and so guide the reader through the inner world of the Ukrainian intellectual that they not only take on new life in art, but unexpectedly acquire a new interpretation of ideas and images by introducting new elements into the development of these themes in all Soviet literature.

Or let us take V. Zemlyak's recent novel *Flock of Swans.* The social collisions which arose in the pre-collectivization and collectivization periods, basically typical throughout the Soviet Union, have here "grown" into a prodigiously specific, yet at the same time indisputably real, soil of the Ukrainian "depths," into a generous world of the national psyche, strong characters, and customs, thus presenting us with an aspect of the people's destiny never written or read about before. And V. Zemlyak's "leaning upon" the general-Soviet "ideological plan" of that period did not in the least prevent him from writing a colorful national novel, and from giving it a truly national, unusually, sensitive, rich and unique image of the Ukrainian people's life (though the image may, perhaps, have fundamental drawbacks where social development is concerned).

We could continue adding other names of writers of all generations, other works of prose, poetry and dramaturgy.

There is an especially profound and intimate contact between the Ukrainian Soviet and the general-Soviet aspects in the portrayal of the positive hero in our literature.

In the treatment and deepening of the image of the hero of contemporary socialist reality, writers in all Soviet literatures are working as though on one plane and, by combining their friendly efforts, penetrate into this image in search of the most promising trends, efficiently exchanging their results and plans. The point is that, first of all, the image of the hero is most intimately associated with

generally political and ethical ideals, and the latter, in all Soviet literatures, have one single social and class platform; secondly, in life itself the advanced type of Soviet man possesses social, ideological and moral qualities that are homogeneously related to all nations although these qualities are expressed in various national, emotionally psychic complexes; thirdly, it is here that our reader discovers the most vivid expression of his own "all-Union" character: in all the republics this character has basic similar requirements and demands (additional evidence of the inner deep-seated singleness of the general communist ideal), it is here that our reader becomes especially sensitive and receptive to everything new that appears in everyone of the national Soviet literatures.

The Soviet reader, whatever his nationality, has at his "beck and call" as a guide for his ideological and ethical orientations, and aesthetic experiences — an extensive and continuously replenished choice of our contemporary hero-images created in all the national literatures. Of these, the reader gives preference not so much to those who are of his own nationality, but to those whom he finds spiritually richer and more interesting, and are portrayed in a manner more true-to-life and with greater craftsmanship.

This principled position on the part of the reader imposes special demands upon all national literatures. Therefore, it is a great joy for a national literature when it creates characters in which the author has "caught" and singled out the new, generaly important features of our contemporary Soviet man for the benefit of all the multinational socialist society, for all the Soviet people. This was done by A. Holovko in *Weeds* and *Mother,* O. Korniychuk in *Platon Krechet* and *Makar Dibrova,* O. Dovzhenko in *Arsenal, The Earth,* his scenario *Poem About the Sea,* O. Honchar in *The Standard-Bearers* and *Tronka,* A. Malyshko in *Prometheus,* M. Stelmakh in *Truth and Falsehood,* L. Pervomaisky in *Wild Honey,* I. Senchenko in *Solomyanka Stories,* to mention but a few.

The current image of this, so to say, general-Soviet literary yet real hero has its complicated and attractive features connected with the further widening of his social and cultural horizons, his further human enrichment, further internationalization of his social existence and

world outlook, his greater social mobility and national "integration," his receptiveness toward other peoples.

This specific historical stage in the formation of the general-Soviet hero is well understood by the reader. A good example is rendered by P. Zahrebelny in his novels on present-day life: *The Day for the People to Come, From the Standpoint of Eternity, Let Us Get to Love,* and to a certain extent in his original "historical-contemporary" work *Wonder.* His protagonists, though they sometimes lack psychological plausibility, are "tailor-made" according to general-Soviet measurments not only in their ideological and political dimensions, but in their entire cultural composition, in the spheres of their spirit and intellect, in the "repertoire" of their deeply personal interests and spiritual potentialities.

At the same time, this structure of the human "soul" does not show up out of nowhere on a bare place, on "no man's land," as it were, but on Soviet and Ukrainian soil; it grows out of the Ukrainian historical background and is the result of decades of educational work by the Communist Party, decades of the authentic reality of Soviet Ukraine.

The success and significance of the best poetic works by M. Bazhan, L. Pervomaisky, A. Malyshko, M. Nahnybida, I. Vyrhan, I. Muratov, P. Voronko, D. Pavlychko, B. Oliynyk, V. Korotych, I. Drach are ensured, first and foremost, by the spiritual weight of their lyrical hero, whose scope is commensurate with that of the general-Soviet hero of today, the general-Soviet socialist ideal — the ideal which incorporates all the complex and contradictory world of contemporary history. Very typical in this sense are B. Oliynyk's last books and poetic cycles, and I. Drach's collection *The Root and the Crown* — these are two very dissimilar poets, yet close equate each other in the search for their own poetic "equivalent" of the dramatic expanse of modern life for their own poetic solution to comtemporary man.

Thus, the general Soviet "status" of Ukrainian modern national literature is not a theoretical postulate, or an adaptation to a political tenet or an imposing of some general standard, but is an authentic literary reality conditioned by the reality of life, as well as the reality of the

historical process. And its roots lie in the general Soviet historical and social content of our life; in our general Soviet ideals and conceptions, social norms, and the spiritual factors which determine the mentality and destiny of an individual and of generations; in the general-Soviet tasks, aims and spirit of our literature.

Since this general Soviet element is a fundamental, basic and leading aspect in all our social life; in the life of each individual (even irrespective of the character of his self-consciousness), the level and depth of its revelation are decisive for the significance, including the national significance, of literature, for its ability to satisfy the interests of its nation, and to be the aesthetic organ of national life.

In the artistic investigation of these regularities and factors, in the artistic portrayal of Soviet mode of life and the image of Soviet man, the hero of our times, made on the basis of national material, each of the national literatures rests upon the experience and gains of all other literatures.

This is only natural: today, a Ukrainian prose writer, for instance, cannot write about the Great Patriotic War if K. Simonov's novels or V. Bychkov's stories on the friendship of peoples had never existed, not to speak of *Lessons in Armenia* by A. Bitov or *My Daghestan* by Rasul Gamzatov; cannot write about the intellectual and ethical aspects of contemporaneity without considering the experience of the Kirghiz Chinghiz Aitmatov, the Russians Yu. Trifonov, P. Proskurina, V. Chivilikhin, S. Sartakov, the Byelorussians I. Shamyakin and I. Melezh, the Latvian Z. Skujin, the Abkhaz I. Tarba, the Kazakh A. Alimzhanov, the Lithuanian Janis Avijus and many, many others. Without such considerations in would be difficult for a prose writer to meet the reader's demands or discover anything new.

It is equally difficult or even impossible for a Ukrainian poet to become a contemporary writer, to reach general-Soviet acclaim without knowing or taking into consideration the poetic standards reached by the wonderful poets of Lithuania and Latvia, by the Georgian poetic school — one of the USSR's most brilliant — by the cluster of poets from the North Caucasus who have greatly matured over the last decade, not to speak of the wealth of Russian poetry.

The expansion of mutual inter-national and inter-literary contacts and influences specifically means the increase of the creative impulse, the greater number of themes and motifs, as well as the very "mass" of the live material and diversity of artistic reactions to it all. This explains the accelerated pace and development of all national literatures: not only those who are less developed and previously backward, but also the most developed, the most advanced, for whom these contacts and joint efforts were a source of energy for acceleration.

But this peculiar ideological and aesthetic "chain reaction," these creative "sparks," which arc from one literature to another, would have merely led to extensiveness, to a literary hypertrophy of outward interpretation and outward diversity and reflection, to a superficial writing-in-the-mode — if the innovation of national authors had not rested firmly upon deep inner creative effort and spiritual need, on the deeply rooted traditions of their own literatures, if the new elements they introduced had not been both a personal and social "ordeal of suffering" on the part of these authors.

Assimilation and influence are not something inherited or borrowed mechanically. They are rather a free reaction on the part of an internally prepared creative "soul," an impulse to create something new and personal, an urge to compete. And when we speak of the susceptibility of our Ukrainian literature to everything new taking place in the neighboring fraternal literatures, we testify to its great inner potentialities and the great number of things it has accomplished.

Besides, whatever the above-mentioned "accelerations" may be, one cannot forget such a basic feature of artistic creativity as in-depth approach and progression, the "slowness" of the ripening of one's creative plan, one's ideological and artistic conceptions, as well as the integrity of one's creative self-assertion. That is why, one should notice in the mutual contacts and influences not only those that are swiftly-passing and momentarity popular, but also those there that are deep-going and long-lasting.

Some people — poorly informed or patriarchal-minded — think that Ukrainian literature was destined to be keyed either to lyrical romanticism or trite sentimentality. Others

think that its themes, problems and motifs stem from the everyday life and poetry of the Ukrainian village, and only from that did they derive and still derive the vital juices of their inspiration. For still others, it is a matter of either pride or disdain.

As a matter of fact, Ukrainian literature has never fitted into any of the above qualifications, and neither, of course, does it do so today.

The fact is that prerevolutionary Ukrainian literature, though it developed under extremely unfavorable conditions, managed (in spite of them) to produce a great ideological and thematical wealth, as well as a diversity of genres and styles. It was pulsing with a mighty social and political upsurge, in other words, an all-dimensional public upsurge (e.g., T. Shevchenko, I. Franko, Lesya Ukrainka, P. Hrabovsky), with a political and publicistic upsurge (from the polemists of the 17th-18th centuries to I. Franko, Lesya Ukrainka, P. Hrabovsky). In its heart lived a deep philosophic tradition or, as we would call it today, the tradition of intellectualism (e.g., H. Skovoroda and later on, works by T. Shevchenko and I. Franko; Lesya Ukrainka's dramatic works and her later poetry; works by O. Kobylyanska). Side by side with this philosophical tradition go the fundamental achievements of social and daily-life prose, the broad foundations — laid first of all by the writings of M. Kotsyubynsky — of social and psychological analytics employing the then latest aesthetic techniques, originally combined with elements of revolutionary romanticism and deep social satire. Side by side with the lyrical and descriptive novelette, as well as that dealing with daily-life and ethnographic themes, there existed V. Stefanyk's "plebeian novella," which in its artistic and philosophic content, laconic expression, force, and perfect form had no equal (or anything close to it, at least) in any European literature of that period. Side by side with S. Rudansky's wise and witty folk sayings existed the chimerical humor of M. Storozhenko, and the grotesque style, the social and psychological writtings of M. Cheremshyna...

Thematically, Ukrainian classical litterateurs — well realizing and zealously performing their sacred duties to the toiling peasantry (quite recently serfs) who made up

the overwhelming majority of the nation and were in fact identified with it — also saw a new social development, and strove, not without success, to explore new social strata, to extend their thematic horizons by portraying the workers (e.g., first and foremost, I. Franko), the intelligentsia including men of the arts (e.g., M. Kotsyubynsky, O. Kobylyanska), by resorting to themes pertinent to other nations and "world" subjects (Lesya Ukrainka, M. Kotsyubynsky), etc...

Ukrainian Soviet literature inherited from its Ukrainian classic counterpart "a good foundation," fruitful and diversified traditions. But the main thing is that it inherited its Ukrainian classic literature's principal bequest: a bequest to serve the working people, to be loyal to progressive social ideals and revolutionary trends. It also inherited a sensitivity to everything new in life and the arts, a readiness to respond to contemporary needs of life, new aesthetic ideas, to look ahead and strive for advancement.

True to these traditions, and developing them, Ukrainian Soviet literature has shown itself capable of learning a great deal from other nations and literatures, and of keeping up to new times and new life.

Today it has practically reached all ideological and thematical horizons; it possesses and is promoting all genres and stylistic trends characteristic of a modern developed socialist literature. Only by taking them all together, and not individually, may we speak of the original "face" (full aspect — **Ed.**) of this literature. Singling out, emphasizing, giving preference to one or another component, as being the most characteristic would certainly be incorrect.

Sometimes, for example, the lyrical and romantic style is claimed to be the most specific and traditional inherent in Ukrainian literature. Even if this were true, then first of all, what great differences exist between those writers who are assigned to the lyrical and romantic school! What a great distance lies between, say, the subjective approach and emotional generosity (which at times verges upon losing one's sense of proportion); between the ethnographic dedication of M. Stelmakh and the light equilibrium of the elevated tone, the clarity and strict stylistic self-discipline of O. Honchar's writings which become increasingly

apparent in every new book that appears — although at times they take on a prosaic dryness.

Secondly, could one possibly say that the tradition of a good, firmly "objective" writing style, one well-substantiated, deliberately social, full of social and psychological analysis — like that, for instance, represented by Andriy Holovko, or somewhat differently by Irina Vilde — is less of a typical thing in Ukrainian Soviet literature?

They say that Ukrainian prose is naturally poetical, and is usually emotionally overdone. As if this style were inherent to the national character! But was the Ukrainian national style really less evident in the exacting, forceful imagery and solidly molded protagonists in Hrihoriy Tyutyunnyk's works, and in Ivan Senchenko's wise laconism and mild restraint — than it was in the wealth of emotion found in Stelmakh or Zemlyak?

And as for what they call "intellectualism" — isn't this a high factor (in various ways!) in the philosophically sated prose of S. Tudor (here we have intellectualism of the "first water"!), in the high summits of Dovzhenko's romanticism, in the sharply sagacious poetry of M. Bazhan, in the delicate simplicity of M. Rylsky and the lexical breadth that unintentionally crept into his poetry, in the fathomless transparent depths of P. Tychyna, and also in the panoramic plots of O. Levada's works.

Here I would like to briefly mention a few representatives of various styles in modern Ukrainian literature. We truly have very many original, dissimilar and different writers — O. Ilchenko, V. Sinenko, M. Tomchaniy, V. Bablyak, R. Fedoriv, O. Sizonenko, R. Bratun, V. Luchuk, R. Lubkivsky, B. Necherda, I. Tsyupa, V. Petlyovany, S. Smilyansky, V. Kucher and many others whose creative paths began only some time ago or are just beginning, as well as those who have travelled a very long creative road. Some literary snobs might say that, in this instance, as well as previously, I have at times mentioned people whose talent was far from being on the same level and yet I have included them in the same list. They would be well advised to think over the following words said by Bertolt Brecht: "To recognize only the very greats signifies not knowing anything about literature. A map of the sky marked with stars of only the first magnitude is not the sky." To make

a group portrait of all the hard-working, fruitful workers in the field of our literature, and even more to give it a veritable delineation in detail, calls for more than one preliminary sketch-study.

We only mentioned this to emphasize the great and diverse range of ideas, themes, styles, traditions and trends in modern Ukrainian literature: this diversity gives our literature inner strength and enables it to respond to all discoveries made in the other fraternal literatures. It does not imitate them, but uses them as sources of inspiration.

In One United Family

The further mutual acquaintance, rapprochement and "reciprocal perception" of Soviet literatures through their interaction as components of a single multinational Soviet literature forms an important factor in the progress of each one, also adding to their creative forces.

The continuous close connections maintained among the national literatures, the latter's constantly deepening interaction and their fusing into one single Soviet literature benefit them all in general, and each one in particular. As mentioned before, this is merely due to the standpoint of other ideological and creative efforts. These contacts are also important because they promote the popularity of the national literatures in the Soviet Union and add to the latter's prestige in the international arena, especially from the standpoint of extending the sphere of their "cultural presence" in the world of today.

The last few years have witnessed a continuous and consistent increase in the factual influences exerted by the fraternal cultures upon the cultural life of every nation in the USSR (and this process will probably continue in the coming years). One of the constituents of this many-sided process is the natural spread of Soviet Ukraine's cultural achievements in the USSR. Today, an ever greater number of Ukrainian books are translated into Russian and other languages; works of Ukrainian dramaturgy, cinematography, music, painting and sculpture are winning nationwide acclaim; a continually growing number of Ukrainian artistic groups make tours to all parts of the USSR and achieve popular results; and many art shows display our

national professional and folk art in numerous towns and cities of the Soviet Union.

Another typical occurence is worthy of notice: the all-Union recognition of one or another artistic work is often the cause of its being taken more seriously "at home," that is, in the land where it was born. This was the case, for example, with the writings of the Osset — Yezetkhan Uruymagovoya, the aforementioned Kirghiz — Chinghiz Aitmanov, as well as the Byelorussian — Vasily Bykov, and also to some extent with those of Rasul Gamzatov (Avar), Yuvan Shestalov (Mansi), Justinas Marcinkjavicus or, speaking of Ukrainians, with the ideas and works of our prominent pedagogue Vasyl Sukhomlynsky.

In this sense, the recognition of one or another artistic development in Russian culture, with its traditionally high criteria, wealth of artistic choise and wide horizons, especially assumes tremendous weight. Take, for example, the works of Olexander Dovzhenko which were admired and even revered by many cultural figures in Russia and analyzed at length and in depth by Russian movie critics and theoreticians. Didn't this help broader cultural circles in Ukraine to fully realize the scope of this unique artistic phenomenon?

It does not mean that "a prophet knows no honor in his own country" or, to put it another way, that those "in his own country" (here: in Ukraine) failed to properly appreciate the artist's talent until they were "prompted" to do so by someone from "outside." Certainly not. What we came across in cases like this is an important objective factor. When something unique in art crosses its national borders and appears in the "big world," it apparently has to undergo an additional test during which its real values are judged and it faces a "cross-examination" by audiences of various nationalities who may discover new and little recognized facets of this gem of art. Only then are we, the representatives of our nation, able to see it from this somewhat unexpected angle, in perspective as it were. Having realized its significance for others, we ourselves begin to see it in a new light.

Such is the atmosphere of our life, such is the regularity of joint purposeful activity in all its spheres; Soviet people of different nationalities, with the warm concern of joint masters, appreciate each other's accomplishments,

help each other in analyzing them, and rejoice together over the successes of one and all. Such friendly appraisal leads to a still better understanding of our achievements. The voice of a poet or an artist needs the greatest auditorial space so that it will carry as far as possible, it needs a variety of dissimilar landscape-acoustics to pick up the echoes and send them back to his native parts, so that these fraternal echoes will be magnified and the sound enriched.

We could give many other examples of how much such a large all-Union auditoria means, or how much the active "blood circulation" running through the national cultures gives to the national writer and artist from the creative aspect and in the sense of expanding the spheres of their art activities.

Ukraine is present in the cultural life of all the Soviet nations, contributing ponderably to its variegated aspects. One could collect an extensive library of works on the Ukrainian theme written by literati and artists of fraternal peoples, as well as Ukrainian orientated surveys by Russian, Byelorussian, Georgian and other national historians, literary and art critics.

A tangible factor in the development of national literatures is not only the influence exerted by Ukrainian Soviet literature — in particular that of its most outstanding writers (such as Pavlo Tychyna, Maxym Rylsky, Yuri Yanovsky, Olexander Dovzhenko, Andriy Holovko and Olexander Korniychuk) — but also the weighty spiritual influence of our classics. The image of the great Taras Shevchenko inspired and inspires today many creators of national literatures; it is invariably among those sacred images which form the guideline, the criterion of how to serve one's people. That was how his role, and a comprehension of it, were depicted by the Russian writer Vsevolod Ivanov and the Tajik poet Gasem Lakhuti, the Byelorussians Yanka Kupala and Yakub Kolas, the Kazakh Jambul Jabaev, by Marietta Shaginyan who wrote an excellent book on Taras Shevchenko, by Mikhail Zoshchenko, author of another original book on the great Bard, by the Georgian poet Yosif Grishashvili and the Armenians Sogomon Torontsi and Gegam Saryan...

In 1936, the *Pravda* newspaper carried a letter in poetry from the working people of Soviet Georgia in which they brilliantly expressed the idea of cultural unity of the

socialist nations and the fact of the spiritual kinship existing among Soviet people of all nationalities:

We honor Rustaveli — this invaluable treasure and gift,
And Sulkhan Orbeliani, our old and beloved fabulist.
The lucid verse of Guramishvili whom we all are used to loving —
Our shepherd, poet, toolmaker, engineer and worker.
Pushkin, Tolstoy and Gogol who are known to the people's masses.
We love the wrathful Shevchenko, and Gorky is dear to us.

"We love the wrathful Shevchenko," are the significant words Pavlo Tychyna used for the title of an article in which he wrote:

"This is the height of praise for the poet from the working people of our Motherland, praise which has been spead by our press in millions of copies throughout the world. Yes, Shevchenko really has a vast auditorium, and now here, now there is this auditorium rings out his wrathful voice, and is caught up by other brilliant writers: such Russian poets for example, as Eduard Bagritsky, also by Tajik, Jewish and Kazakh men of letters... But here we must admit that the first place in the list belongs to the Byelorussian and Academician of the Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences Yanka Kupala."

Since then an ever greater amount of poetry and prose dedicated to the Kobzar has appeared almost every year in the fraternal literatures, the best of them quickly reaching the Ukrainian reader. Thus, quite recently the Ukrainian reader received the Ukrainian version of the story by the Karakalpak writer Urazak Bakbaulov *Taras on the Aral Sea.*

Lesya Ukrainka has also become near and dear to all the peoples of the USSR.

"Lesya Ukrainka," says the Georgian writer Georgiy Tsitsishvili, "belongs to those great persons who teach other peoples, enoble them, draw them closer together and give them the wings of aspiration."

The Byelorussian poetess Yevdokia Los had this to say:

"In Byelorussia, Lesya Ukrainka is loved as much as our people's poets Yanka Kupala, Yakub Kolas and other noted classical writers.

"The name of Lesya Ukrainka is placed among the top ranking writers of glorious Byelorussian literature. Her works are published in our language, and her first translator in Byelorussia was Yanka Kupala."

"The genius of Lesya Ukrainka," adds the Russian author and translator Maria Komissarova, "belongs to all humanity."

The outstanding Armenian poetess Silva Kaputikyan says:

"Lesya Ukrainka is a woman who united her tremendous talent with tremendous moral power. Her image helps me live, work... serve my people selflessly, and know that in this lies a writer's calling... She was a woman-Prometheus..."

Representatives of many fraternal peoples spoke warmly about Mikhailo Kotsyubynsky, Vasyl Stefanyk, Ivan Franko, our other classical writers, noting that the creations of these glorious sons of Ukraine helped form and develop the literatures of a number of nations of former Russia, and that today these creations emerge as a tangible factor in their cultural life.

How many heartfelt words of acknowledgement and gratitude have been spoken of Soviet Ukrainian writers by their counterparts, from the other republics!

"We recall with pride the fact that the Uzbek theme and the Uzbek people inspired Ivan Le to write his *Intermontane Romance,* and inspired M. Tereshchenko and M. Ushakov in their wonderful poetic cycles," declared Nazir Safarov of Uzbekistan in his address to the Sixth Congress of Ukrainian Writers. "As regards Mykola Bazhan, he belongs to you and to us at the same time. Mykola Bazhan is a people's poet of Uzbekistan (this honorary title was conferred upon him for a fundamental work — his translation from Old Uzbek into Ukrainian of Alisher Navoi's epic *Farkhad and Shirin* — **I.D.**)...Works by Taras Shevchenko, and Ivan Franko, books by Maxym Rylsky and Olexander Korniychuk, Oles Honchar and Mikhailo Stelmakh are also very popular with us."

"Estonians can read in their native language the works of the great Kobzar, of Lesya Ukrainka, Ivan Franko, Mikhailo Kotsyubynsky, Vasyl Stefanyk, and other Ukrainian men of letters..." Vladimir Beekman stressed at the Congress, "and the works of such authors as Maxym Rylsky, Oles Honchar, Yuri Zbanatsky, Leonid Pervomaisky have also been published in Estonian..."

The list of similar statements could be much longer. The works of our Ukrainian litterateurs are, in fact, pour-

ing into the cultural life of all the peoples in the USSR in an ever wider stream. Throughout the 1946-1966 period alone, they were published in 44 languages of the peoples of the Soviet Union with a circulation of 110,800,000 copies.

The process of acquainting the USSR peoples with Ukrainian literature is doubtlessly under way, and is gaining pace. Thus, *The Yearbook of USSR Publications* issued by the All-Union Book Chamber shows that 38 books and collections were published in translations (in Russian and other languages of the Soviet peoples) during 1972. These include Russian publications of the works by Ivan Le, O. Korniychuk, O. Honchar, Yu. Zbanatsky, Yu. Shovkoplyas, Yu. Martych and others; publications in Latvian (*The Riders* by Yu. Yanovsky, *The Kind-Hearted Devil* by P. Zahrebelny); in Uzbek (*Tronka* by O. Honchar); in Georgian (Anthology of Ukrainian Poetry); and in Tatar and Kalmyk (also anthologies of Ukrainian poetry). Similar information could be furnished with regard to other periods.

Simultaneously, a great deal of work is being done in the Republic by translating into Ukrainian and publishing the best works of the national literatures of the USSR. It is not difficult to imagine how complicated this mater is, if you take into account the number of languages of which Soviet literature is composed, as well as the difficulties encountered in the training of translators, etc. Nevertheless, practically all the most outstanding achievements of other national literatures are made available to the Ukrainian reader in his mother tongue. In the period between the Fourth and the Fifth Congresses of Ukrainian Writers, 537 books were published that had been translated from languages of the fraternal literatures, including 118 translated from Byelorussian, 76 from Georgian, 65 from Lithuanian. From 1967 to 1971, 376 books were published that had been translated from 25 languages of the USSR peoples, plus an additional 190 books for children.

During the Days of Estonian Literature and the Arts recently held in Ukraine, the following figures were made public: throughout 1940-1974, 37 Ukrainian versions of Estonian literary works were published with a circulation of some 1,500,000 copies; while Estonians translated 59 Ukrainian writings, publishing them in as many as 1,000,000 copies.

Once again, this process is being stepped up continuously. According to *The Book Printing Choronicles,* issued by the Ukrainian SSR Book Chamber, during 1975, in only ten months, as many as 20 books by authors of other USSR nations (Russian literature excluded), were published; these were translated into Ukrainian from 16 languages, and did not include publications for children. They included *Jamilya,* a novel by the Kirghiz writer Chinghiz Aitmatov, *The White Book,* a novel by the Armenian writer R. Kochar, *Mountain Tops are not Asleep* by the Kabardinian A. Keshokov, *Love and Hatred* by the Latvian Z. Grivas, *The North Wind* by the Azerbaijanian H. Musaiev, *People of the Sands* by the Turkmenian B. Hudainazarov, and works by Byelorussian literati (Ya. Bryl's *Stained Glass,* I. Shamyakin's *Uneasy Happiness* and V. Bykov's *Obelisk),* etc.

Soviet Ukrainian writers have always been markedly distinguished by their "inclination toward the people" which was classically formulated by P. Tychyna, and such traditions may be traced back to T. Shevchenko, I. Franko, P. Hrabovsky, Lesya Ukrainka and M. Kotsyubynsky.

It is well known among Ukrainians that P. Tychyna, M. Bazhan, M. Rylsky, M. Tereshchenko, L. Pervomaisky, V. Mysyk, V. Sosyura, A. Malyshko and other noted poets did a great deal to make the poetic gems of the other Soviet peoples available to their native people.

We also know that Pavlo Tychyna's Armenian acquaintances and friends were much moved by his perfect knowledge of Armenian literature and culture, and that, thanks to Saifa Kudash, he also became very familiar with Bashkir literature.

M. Rylsky and P. Tychyna were not only efficient translators, but also scrupulous researchers and ardent propagators of literatures of the USSR nations. In these spheres they left behind them a truly enormous heritage of translations and literary criticism. Let us recall, for example, P. Tychyna's brilliant sketches on the classic Bashkir litterateur M. Gafuri and the Kazakh akhyn (minstrel) Jambul Jabaev, on the Armenian writer O. Tumanyan and on that nation's famous epos *David of Sassoon;* let us recall Rylsky's articles on A. Isaakyan, Ye. Charents, A. Pushkin, A. Chekhov and A. Blok. They are permeated with lofty sentiments of a common historical and cultural

destiny for the fraternal peoples, with the lofty feelings of internationalism.

Much is being done along these lines by M. Nahnybida, V. Kochevsky, P. Voronko, B. Oliynyk, V. Bychko, P. Doroshko, O. Novytsky, Yu. Yushchenko, D. Pavlychko, V. Korotych, B. Stepanyuk, and many other poets and prose writers, not to mention a large group of professional translators. Here, too, the younger generation inherit the traditions of their older counterparts.

The intensification of literary and cultural contacts in recent years (reciprocal trips, exchanges, various ten-day festivals, concert tours, translations, etc.) is of tremendous importance not only for raising the internationalist cultural level of readers and the general public, but also for the internal development of cultures as such.

In the summer of 1975, for instance, the Uzbek SSR State Academic Opera and Ballet Theater named after Alisher Navoi made a successful concert tour in Kiev. Thousands of Kiev residents saw and heard in its artistic interpretation not only the masterpieces of world classics and classical works of the other peoples of our country, but also Kazakh national operas and ballets: *Dilorom, Talisman of Love* and *Love and the Sword.* They acquainted themselves with the creative endeavors of such prominent conductors as M. Ashrafi and D. Abdurakhmanova, with the choreographic school of T. Khanum and M. Turgunbayeva.

The magnificent art of present-day Uzbekistan was not only admired by Ukrainian audiences, but will probably even be incorporated in the creative works of Ukrainian men of the arts. And very likely the Kazakh artists will put to good use their stay in Ukraine and their direct contacts with Ukrainian audiences and Ukrainian cultural figures. In fact, the visitors appeared to attach a great deal of importanee to this event.

"Mutual contacts and the mutual enrichment of cultures," stated People's Artist of the Uzbek SSR Dilbar Abdurakhmanova, "is an excellent stimulant for the development of literature and the arts by the fraternal peoples of our country. It is from this point that we regard our tour of Ukraine's capital.

"The friendship of the Ukrainian and Uzbek peoples

has deep roots: together with the representatives of other peoples of our Homeland, Ukrainians helped Uzbeks in the days of severe class battles, and many Ukrainians fell in battle in Turkestan fighting the *basmatches*;* this friendship sealed in blood grew even stronger during the Great Patriotic War."

The life and creative contacts of Ukrainian literati with the working people and writers of our other nationalities continue to expand and deepen. Some ten or twenty years ago these contacts were by and large limited to contacts with Russian and a few of the most advanced literatures. Today, they embrace not only all the Union republics, but also the autonomous republics and regions — all the nations and nationalities of the Soviet Union.

Over the last few years, Ukraine has been visited by 56 delegations from the fraternal republics, including close on 400 writers; also ten-day festivals or Weeks of Georgian, Kazakh, Kirghiz, Komi, Chuvash, Kalmyk, Khakass, Yakut, Armenian and a number of other literatures have been held in Ukraine; and Ukrainian men of letters (28 delegations), on their part, have made return visits to demonstrate their creative achievements. Recently, Days of the fraternal Byelorussian and Estonian literatures and cultures were held throughout Ukraine.

We should also mention the Kiev Spring traditional All-Union art festivals, and the Days of Ukrainian Soviet literature regularly observed in various regions of Ukraine and in the other republics. They also form an important link in the general plans to promote the mutual acquaintance of the peoples and the reciprocal enrichment of their cultures, plans which are being continuously expanded to help the development of each national culture.

At the end of the last century, one pedagogical publication calculated that it would take two milleniums to liquidate illiteracy among the "outlanders."

---

* Kulaks: anti-Soviet elements who gathered into armed gangs to resist Soviet rule, robbed the local population, etc.— Tr.

But what remains of these predictions today? Indeed, did not the great humanist Pushkin prove to be the best prophet, who wished and believed that his name would be known "throughout Great Rus" and mentioned by "every one of its living tongues"?

Yes, every nation existing in our great multinational Land of Soviets looks upon Pushkin as their very own, just as they do with Shevchenko, Rustaveli, Rainis and all other giants of the spirit born on the soil of our common Homeland. Our peoples have found the road to one another, and the road keeps growing wider for there is plenty we can benefit from each other.

Tychyna — with his innate gift of catching every nuance of each new social phenomenon, of foreseing its development and finding aphoristic poetic formulas to express it — called this process an "arc-shaped overhead passage to the peoples." This is no longer a lone individual's thirst for culture, but a mass phenomenon, an "arc-shaped overhead passage to the peoples," which draws them together. Vladimir Lenin emphasized that only when something has become part and parcel of the everyday habits of the masses can it be considered as finally established. And today, before our very eyes, internationalism stemming from a political idea has become a conviction for tens of millions of people, and is currently becoming their political and social mode of life.

Let us give serious thought to the significance of the extensive, over growing processes of mutual acquitance and mutual perception among the USSR peoples, of their cultural, artistic and literary exchanges. Let us give serious thought to the significance of the new forms of inter-republican, inter-national contacts that have acquired such a wide scope in recent years. These forms are brimming with labor, social and cultural content. The working people of the republics and regions take part in socialist emulation drives, exchange know-how, their production innovations, arrange exchange-visits of delegations and amateur-groups concerts, keep each other informed about their affairs, maintain personal contacts, rejoice at each other's successes, sympathize with and help one another. Doesn't all this promote the widening of the political and social horizons of the masses, improve mutual acquaintanceship among the nations, make concrete and

enrich the ideas that people of different nationalities have about each other? Do they not, therefore, foster personal self-knowledge, and developing in each person a feeling of self-respect and amicability? Do they not enrich and deepen our people's conception of their common Homeland, give them an immediate realization of her vast expanses and resources, and of the unity of all her many peoples?

Taken as a whole, are not all these wide-spread and steady ties, contacts, cooperative efforts among the nations, with their reciprocal effects — now all-national in scope — simply a historical process of the gradual developing of internationalism as a political principle into a social reality for the multimillion mass of our people? Is it not also a process of the individual's emotional perception of the significant fact that our multinational Homeland really exists? And finally, do they not all represent a process of the intellectual growth and humanistic development of million of people? Marx said that his real human wealth was the wealth of his real contacts. In the processes just discussed, the Soviet people's real social and living contacts are immeasurably expanding — which implies the growth of the people's real human wealth.

In speaking about the exchange of cultural values, of one republic's holding ten-day festivals of literature and the arts of another, in speaking of inter-republican festivals, arts festivals, concert tours, concert exchanges between towns, regions etc., one should draw attention to the fact that today all these cultural undertakings are far from being episodic occurrences. They represent a large-scale, regular and continuous flow of mass cultural and reciprocal information, of topical literary and art production, a harmonious cultural reciprocal enrichment. Is not all this a process of the culturally and psychologically "securing" of internationalism, a process of developing the social and psychological aspect of the masses' internationalistic world outlook? Does not direct acquaintance with the diversity of national-cultural facts and national-cultural styles, personal involvement in acts of cultual communication, and taking part in these acts, give one an immediate realization of the multinational character of cultures? Does it not help one understand these questions and work out a relevant positive social direction? Does it not entail a favorable attitude on the part of the masses, an attitude

which, in turn, means a reaction toward them of friendly concern? In other words, does all this not instill in the masses certain internationalistic features and an internationalistic spirit — thus promoting a greater intensification of their development and rapprochement?

It is all these processes that have laid — in the given case, on the level of the social and cultural world outlook, on the social and cultural psychology of the popular masses — "the foundations" of the further and deeper internationalization of our national cultures.

Through the Eyes of the Big World

It is common knowledge that certain circles in the West obstinately refused—just as they often refuse today — to recognize the multinational character of the Soviet state. Contrary to reality they importunately refer to the USSR as *Russia*, to the Soviet people as *Russians* and to everything Soviet as *Russian*. As a matter of fact, this, so to say, terminological tradition betrays a deep-rooted provocative political tendency which purports, on the one hand, to identify the Soviet Union with the colonial Russian Empire, and on the other, to abuse and humiliate the non-Russian peoples of the USSR.

This tendency is also fed by a lack of knowledge on the part of some persons in the West, or else is due to their sheer utter ignorance. Aside from these types, even solidly-respectable bourgeois politicos in the West often betray their ignorance and outrageous tactlessness in the matter.

Without doubt, back of these rather peculiar attitudes lies the process that stems from the very inception of our multinational socialist country, the process of gradually acquainting the world public with the cultural values of all the USSR peoples, the process of the gradual emergence on the international cultural scene of nations and nationalities who, as the Slovak poet Lacco Novomiecki put it, were previously known only to the "gendarmes and executioners." True, the extent to which these cultures were known abroad did not correspond to their objective historical worth.

To spread the truth about the multinational character

of our state and about the flourishing of the people's national modes of life and their national cultures, to popularize on a world scale the works of our multinational Soviet literature and the arts has become for us a matter of political, social and cultural significance (probably no less important than timely and valid information on the social and economic successes of our society). This significant matter is considered to be one of the immediate tasks facing the creative unions in the first place.

Almost thirty years ago, shortly after the end of the Great Patriotic War, Maxym Rylsky wrote:

"...Do not the works of the already mature, though young, Byelorussian literature — such as those of Yanka Kupala, Yakub Kolas, Bogdanovich, Glyebka, Brovka, Maxim Tank and Arkadiy Kuleshov — deserve greater world popularity? Are the Georgian, Armenian, Azerbaijan, Uzbek, Kazakh, Tajik and other literatures of the peoples of our Homeland not worthy of being popularized most widely?

"Popularizing the literatures of other Soviet peoples, alongside the great Russian literature, is one of the major tasks life has set before the Soviet Writers Union."

Other branches of culture and the arts, and other creative unions were faced with a similar task.

Much has been done in recent years and over the last decades along these lines. As a result, even in the bourgeois countries of the West, contrary to political prejudices and snobbish contempt for the achievements of "uncivilized" nations or national "minorities" — traditional in certain cultural circles — the attitude toward the national cultures of the USSR peoples is gradually changing, and interest in them is growing.

Great popularizing and educational work in this respect is being carried out abroad by the communist press, by progressive public circles, progressive litterateurs, artists, journalists and cultural figures.

Such proletarian writers as Henri Barbusse (French), Martin Andersen Nekse (Danish), Johannes Becher and Anna Seghers (German) were enthusiastic propagators of Soviet national literatures. The same is being done today by such French writers as Louis Aragon and Andre Stil, by the Austrian Hugo Guppert, the West German Peter Schütt, the English writers Jack Lindsay, James Aldridge and

Dennis Ogden, and by the American writers Philip Bonoski and Joseph North, to mention but a few.

In 1955 Louis Aragon used the formula "Soviet literatures" to emphasize the multinational character of our literature. It was understood then as a paradox (though it was again used in the 1930s by Henri Barbusse). But since then the French have had an opportunity to read in translation numerous works of not only Soviet Russian, but also Soviet Ukrainian and other literatures of the USSR peoples. Popular in that country were also prose works by the Kazakh A. Nurpeyisov and poetry by O. Suleimanov, and especially the writings of the Kirghiz Chinghiz Aitmatov. All this helped to develop in the progressive circles of the French public a correct concept about the multinational Soviet literature.

As regards the achievements of contemporary Soviet literature and acquainting the foreign public with these achievements, Andre Stil stressed: "One should mention the books written by authors who belong to different nations of the Soviet Union, such as Chinghiz Aitmatov, Rasul Gamzatov, Yuri Ritkheu, and many others whose works embrace various aspects of present-day life."

Whereas prior to the Revolution mankind knew nothing, or almost nothing, about the cultures of the "Russian" peoples inhabiting Central Asia and Kazakhstan, today European capitals are the venues of exhibitions dedicated to the pictorial arts of Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Turkmenia, Kirghizia and Tajikistan, while artistic ensembles and soloists from these republics perform now on many stages of the world. This is what the German author P. Opitz wrote about the popularity of Chinghiz Aitmatov, representatitve of the literature which was actually born of the Great October Socialist Revolution: "Only on rare occasions in German cultural life have the works of a foreign writer ever so stirred readers' hearts, or that his readers would carry on such hot debates over his writings, as is now the case with Chinghiz Aitmanov's books." Further on he added: "People have at once begun reading, and with tremendous interest, the works of Jolol Ikrami, Abdijamil Nurpeyisov and other writers of the Soviet East that have been published in German over the last seven or eight years." After visiting African countries, the Soviet writer A. Safronov stated: "People in Senegal who, one

might think, are far from interested in literature, used to ask me where they could obtain translations of works by Chinghiz Aitmatov and Rasul Gamzatov."

Several decades ago, the classic of Latvian literature R. Blauman mournfully asked himself whether there would ever appear a writer in Latvia "whose creative works would ever shine in the vast expanses outside the narrow borders of our Motherland?" Answering this today one could mention Janis Rainis, Andrei Upits, Alexander Chaks, Vilis Lacis, Anna Sakse, Ajars Vacietis and, of course, Rudolf Blauman himself: his works have come out in many languages and the movie film *First Frost* based on topics from his novel so named — now ranks among the masterpieces of modern cinematography.

Speaking at the Fifth Congress of Soviet Writers, the well-known litterateur from Latvia's neighboring Lithuania A. Beljauskas emphasized his gratitude to the "public and literary activities of writers and translators in our country in organizing the exchange of valuable literary works — treasures of man's spiritual creativity. It was this that made known to the world K. Donelaitis' immortal poem *Seasons of the Year,* P. Cvirka's writings, the poetry of E. Myezhelaitis and S. Neris; it was thus that the works of A. Venolova, E. Simonautite, Yu. Baltushis, J. Avijus, M. Sluskis, Yu. Marcinkjavicus, A. Maldonis, A. Baltakis and many of our other writers found the way to bookstore shelves in our other republics and in different countries, and perhaps even to their readers' hearts. It was thus that the world learned more about the industrious Lithuanian people who had chosen the enlightened road leading to socialism and who are now building their happy future."

So the world is learning all the more about the other peoples living in our vast country, and is beginning to draw all the more from their spiritual treasuries.

Below is a characteristic statement made by the progressive West German poet and publicist P. Schütt who wrote in the May 11, 1972, issue of *Deutsche Volkzeitung*: "The Soviet Union is a multinational state which is bigger than Russia alone. This fact is often ignored or refuted in our country, because it does not agree with the distorted picture painted here. The Soviet Union is made up of a good hundred different peoples who have their own languages, their own cultures and literatures. Over the

last few years, the literature of each of the non-Russian Soviet nations has become richer and more significant."

Addressing the Fifth Congress of Soviet Writers, the prominent American author Jerry North specially emphasized the internationalism of Soviet literature and its multinational accord. The same thing is said by many other progressive cultural figures in the West and by those abroad who are friendly toward our literature and the arts.

The Ukrainian facet of the polyhedral crystal of Soviet culture, a facet that is unique and of great depth and inexhaustible, is all the more often being displayed to humanity in its all the more dazzling color.

With its ancient roots and long history, Ukrainian culture also has old traditions of international contacts. As one of the advanced Slavic cultures, it had been an important element in European spiritual life for several centuries. The tsarist colonial yoke suppressed its progress, and then cut the arteries that had linked it to the big world, but it was never able to completely "nullify" its existence there.

After the new Ukrainian literature was born in the 19th century, a few of its best works, the Ukrainian classics, began to earn world recognition even prior to the October Revolution (incidentally, this recognition was largely due to friendly cooperation on the part of distinguished sons of the fraternal Russian people and of progressive figures in Russian culture — from Ivan Turgenev to Maxim Gorky, and the latter, then and later, with much affection popularized the works of Mikhailo Kotsyubynsky, Vasyl Stefanyk, Olga Kobylyanska and Lesya Ukrainka).

Translations of a number of writings by T. Shevchenko, I. Franko, M. Kotsyubynsky, Lesya Ukrainka, Olga Kobylyanska, Marko Vovchok, H. Kvitka-Osnovyanenko and V. Stefanyk appeared in the Slavic countries, in Germany, France and Great Britain (not counting the numerous Russian translations).

Following the Great October Socialist Revolution, there was a noticeabe growth of interest abroad of Ukrainian culture — particularly literature. According to data given in the monograph *The Ukrainian People's Spiritual Flourishing* (Kiev, 1972) written by collaborating specialists during the period between the First and the Second World Wars, T. Shevchenko's works were published four times in Poland, three times in Czechoslovakia and once in Italy;

works by I. Franko were published twice in Czechoslovakia and once in Germany. Collections of M. Kotsyubynsky's works came out in Czechoslovakia and Rumania, and poetry collections by Lesya Ukrainka were printed in Germany.

Academican Olexander Biletsky was well justified when he said that not only Taras Shevchenko and Ivan Franko, but also... "Marko Vovchok, Panas Myrny, Mikhailo Kotsyubynsky, Lesya Ukrainka and Vasyl Stefanyk were all phenomena of exceptional inter-Slavic and international significance."

Separate editions of Soviet Ukrainian literary works began being published abroad. Thus P. Tychyna's collection of poetry *Wind from Ukraine,* O. Korniychuk's play *Death of the Squadron* and Ivan Le's *Intermontane Romance* were published in Czechoslovakia and Yu. Yanovsky's *The Riders* in France, to mention a few.

The victory of the multinational Soviet people in the Great Patriotic War considerably raised the prestige of their socialist culture all over the world. Public interest in Ukrainian literature was also growing everywhere. New editions of the Ukrainian literary classics came off the press in various countries abroad.

Simultaneously, they translated and published Soviet Ukrainian literary works in increasing numbers.

The Republican book trade organizations export Ukrainian literature to more than 100 countries all over the world. *Ukrnihoexport* annually ships abroad close on a million copies of books publised in the Republic, of which a goodly number are fiction or books on painting and other fine arts.

Cultural circles abroad are following, with increasing care, the literary and art trends in our Republic, interested in new developments. They not only publish translations of works by recognized litterateurs of the older generation, but also those of the middle and the younger generation.

But that is not all. Apart from translating and publishing abroad these Soviet Ukrainian literary works, the latter become, more often than not, the subject of scientific study by Slavists and Sovietologists in many countries.

The role and place of the aforementioned literary works in the joint achievements of Soviet literature as a whole are making themselves felt both in depth and spatial dimen-

sions. The Polish literary critic A. Dragowicz, for example, in *Nowe Ksiazke* names the creative works of a number of modern Ukrainian writers as being part of the noticeable events in Soviet literature. The Hungarian critic Z. Islac in his article *Songs are Ukraine's Defenders* written on the occasion of the publication in Hungarian of an anthology of Ukrainian poetry juxtaposed characteristic features in the creative works of a number of prominent Ukrainian and Hungarian poets, singling out what was important for European poetry in general. These are only several examples of the many that could be provided.

As a component part of all Soviet literature, Soviet Ukrainian literature more or less exerts some influence upon its counterparts in the fraternal socialist countries. Thus, the well-known Bulgarian writer G. Karaslavov observed:

"As regards spirit and purpose, our literatures — Ukrainian and Bulgarian — are closely linked, for they have both developed under the influence of prominent Russian writers and have always served the interests of our peoples. The Ukrainian authors Taras Shevchenko, Marko Vovchok, Lesya Ukrainka and Ivan Franko made outstanding contributions to the advancement of our young Bulgarian literature. Today, as part of the world's most advanced Soviet literature, Ukrainian literature serves as an example for the creative writings of modern Bulgarian writers."

The Czech author J. Rybak wrote: "The names of T. Shevchenko, I. Franko and those of our contemporaries like P. Tychyna, M. Rylsky, O. Korniychuk, O. Honchar, A. Malyshko, M. Bazhan and many others are an inseparable component of our literature. At the basis of all this our aspiration to create values from which all peoples and countries of the Socialist Commonwealth can derive benefit, the lofty exchange of ideas and the best achievements of peaceful labor — lies the mighty force of the Leninist ideas, the ideas of communism."

Prominent writers of our other national literatures have also more or less exerted an influence beyond the borders of our country.

The Azerbaijanian poet Suleiman Rustam, who was a friend of Nazim Khikmet for many years, testified that this eminent master of Turkish and world literature "was under the beneficial influence of the young proletarian poetry of Azerbaijan."

In his foreword to the French edition of the first part of A. Nurpeyisov's trilogy *Blood and Sweat,* Louis Aragon placed this work on a par with the most outstanding creations of contemporary world literature and stressed that this was the "first significant step forward in the further development of modern novel-writing." A. Nurpeyisov's epopee was also published in the USA, Turkey, the German Democratic Republic, and twice in France.

We have more than once mentioned the influence of A. Auezov, a classic of Soviet Kazakh literature, upon a number of writers in Asian countries. The Kazakh prose writer A. Alimzhanov proudly spoke about that at the Fifth Congress of Soviet Writers:

"Auezov's influence is also corroborated by writers from other peoples both in our country and abroad, because the process of mutual literary enrichment is taking place everywhere today."

The Turkish prose writer A. Ozyalchiner singles out from among modern Soviet litterateurs the Kirghiz Chinghiz Aitmatov, the Kazakh T. Akhtanov and the Georgian N. Dumbadze.

The novel *His Majesty, Man,* by the Uzbek writer R. Fayzi, aroused a fair amount of interest in many countries throughout the world. It has been translated into seven languages and was recently published in Bulgarian and Vietnamese translations.

A collection dedicated to the eminent Lithuanian poet Eduardas Mezhelaitis was released in Sweden as part of the *We and World Literature* series.

Mirza-Tursun Zade, the famed Tajik poet, Hero of Socialist Labor and Lenin Prize Winner, said: "The interest in Tajik literati in Iran is tremendous."

Many other facts and examples, just as gratifying, could be provided. In order to better understand their significance, one has to bear in mind that the ruling circles in Western countries, as well as bourgeois publishers, are quite reluctant to maintain the reciprocal quota in published cultural exchanges — specifically, in every possible way, they try to hinder the process of foreign readers' getting widely acquainted with the phenomena of modern Soviet literature. Our press has already provided factual data which show that incomparably more works by authors from capitalist countries are published in the USSR than

works by Soviet authors printed in these same capitalist countries. Recently Moscow's *Literaturnaya gazeta* (Literary Gazette) interviewed B. Stukalin, Chairperson of the State Committee for Publishing Houses, Book Printing and Book Trade under the USSR Council of Ministers, who emphasized the fact that many bourgeois publishers are laying themselves out to limit the opportunities of their reading public to acquaint themselves with the best works of Soviet literature, that they are trying to keep under wraps its greatest achievements, the achievements that have become a noticeable phenomenon in world literature. As a result, the fact that a disproportion exists is perfectly evident... Bourgeois experts, as a rule, "pay no attention" even to generally recognized representatives of literatures of the many peoples in the USSR.

All this is certainly far from being incidental. The bourgeoisie and the reactionary circles in the capitalist countries are doing their utmost to interfere with the dispersal of the truth about the Land of Soviets, about the socialist way of life, and about the flourishing of the once oppressed nations and their successes in all spheres of life; they are doing their utmost to interfere with the ideological, aesthetic and spiritual influence exerted by multinational Soviet literature. Thus, the sphere of cultural exchanges becomes a sphere of an acute ideological and class struggle.

However, the situation is changing for the better, especially during the last few years; under the conditions of peaceful coexistence, the multinational Soviet literature is (advancing to new horizons — **Tr.**) taking over one position after another throughout the whole world, to widen and deepen its influence upon the foreign reader. It is these very historical shifts that the facts provided in this chapter testify to. Every such fact means one more victory won by the world of social good over the world of social evil, a victory won by the future over the past. Whether big or small, such victories do not simply happen, by their own inertia as it were. They are won only through painstaking work on the part of thousands of friends and propagators of our literature all over the world. They are guaranteed by the high efficiency of socialist ideology and socialist culture in giving mankind the "living bread" of the spirit.

* * *

The historical fact of the gradual realization by the foreign worldwide public of the multinational character of our country, as well as of the multinational character of its socialist culture, the fact that the cultures of other peoples within the USSR are acquiring ever greater importance — alongside the great Russian culture — in the world of spiritual life, are facts of truly epochal significance. Not only significant from the standpoint of culture, but also from the general humanistic and political standpoint.

The pre-socialist world with its social, class and national antagonisms could not provide all nations with a normal — equal and permanent — outlet to the expanses of the "bigger" world, into the international arena. These antagonisms gave rise to, or strengthened, such perverse phenomena as national geopolitical expansion, competition among nations; such as the migration of active and ambitious elements of small nations to bigger nations with the aim of finding a wider sphere of life for self-exhibitionism; such as national provincialism, national jealousy, egotism, hermeticism, etc. And so the question of the worldwide international worth of every nation's cultural, artistic creativities are interspersed with these complex sophisticated phenomena.

This question has two sides that scarcely ever correspond to each other. One of them is the objective extent to which one or another national culture is of interest to most people of the world, the objective extent to which it corresponds to the life of the "bigger world." The other side of this question is the literary reputation and popularity of a national culture, the extent to which it is spread throughout the world, as well as its availability to other nations. Until recently both sides of this question were fatally dependent upon the size and "historical worth" of a nation, as well as on its position in the international political arena (though, of course, other factors were also involved—linguistic, religious, geographical, and many others).

A quick and lasting popularity for "spiritual" creative works and the artistic output of "great" hegemonic nations rest wholly upon the latter's political prestige and the historical reputation they have acquired, rest on the constant interest they attract from other nations, and on

their traditional contacts and exchange-channels with other nations, and so on.

In the bourgeois world, a "small" nation has much fewer opportunities, if any at all, along these lines. In addition, the life of a "small" nation has a fixed historically objective limitation under capitalistic conditions; and bourgeois-national antagonisms make the life of an artist in a "small" nation still harder, often proving a barrier to his making his way into the Big World of creative art, a barrier to the brilliance of his literary ideology, content and form achieving generally-human and world significance.

All this does not mean that the arts of the "smaller" nation, or its artists, are unable to achieve world standards. It simply means that, compared to those of a "bigger" nation, they have fewer opportunities and travel a thornier path to achieve such standards (world recognition — Tr.).

Only a few geniuses in the arts who were sons and artists of the "smaller" nations (e. g. E. Verhaeren, M. Maeterlinck, S. Lagerloff and J. Sibelius) succeeded in winning international acclaim quickly, and in becoming outstanding figures in the world. Besides, even those who did succeed, as a rule, belonged to nations once considered "Big" in the past and therefore to have a relevant heritage and prestige that was world-recognized and historically supported. But the Montenegrin P. Niegos, the Slovene F. Presern and the Slovak P. Hvezdoslav were not destined to reach such heights of success.

If, for example, we measured the world popularity of the classic of Byelorussian literature M. Bogdanovich prior to the October Revolution, or of the prominent Latvians Janis Rainis, O. Chak and Andrei Upits in the period of "independent" bourgeois Latvia — would such a measurement on the popularity-scale correspond to their objective world signifance today? And what about our own H. Skovoroda and V. Stefanyk? Before the October Revolution, even such epochal creations of the human spirit as Shota Rustaveli's brilliant poem *The Knight in the Tiger's Skin* or K. Donelaitis's *Seasons of the Year* were almost unknown to the civilized world.

Socialism has found a constructive solution to the problem of the *national* and the *general-human* (all-hu-

mankind — Tr.) in the sphere of culture. It provides for every nation, even the smallest, to be directly involved in world-historical creativity, it gives a creative outlet into the wide Big World through the international community of socialist nations.

Each socialist nation, while retaining its individuality (in other words, continuing its own development) simultaneously, as it were, crosses its borders into a new historical community — the Soviet people. Each nation as a component of the Soviet people, each republic as a subject of the Soviet Union, "rising above" itself surpasses its national limits and opportunities and reaches immense historical and spiritual expanses, the immense plane tangential to world history. The dynamics and scope of national life are growing beyond comparison. It is as if each nation is making its creations to fit not only its own "stature" but also to fit the "stature" of the entire Soviet Union, of all the Soviet people. The demand for its material and spiritual production will always be unrestricted, and a nation will be able to give mankind everything it is capable of producing. Its creative forces are not destined to slumber through the centuries or wither away to no purpose as they often did in pre-socialist history.

By acquiring general Soviet importance, now the highly artistic creations of national artists are all the oftener taking on a world importance which is perfectly comprehensible: the international weight of the social and spiritual experience of Soviet society is undeniable, and a deeper interest in it is continuously spreading all over the world. Naturally, all this is extended to the artistic interpretation of this experience.

Besides, as the possessor of national cultural heritages and present-day achievements, this society has become the great Soviet state, with its international prestige, cultural connections, opportunities for properly representing and popularizing its artistic attainments in the world, and thus taking a definite place in world history and in the regard of its contemporaries. Were Rustaveli, Donelaitis, Shevchenko or Franko ever as popular at any time in the past as they are today? Only now, during Soviet times, have they been truly put into the spiritual human treasure-hall as part of the wealth of the common spiritual heritage of the multinational socialist community — which exerts a

strong influence upon all the cultural life of the world.

How many memorial jubilees of prominent Soviet cultural figures, from Biruni to Lesya Ukrainka, have been celebrated during the last few years, all through the world, under the auspices of UNESCO!

Scientific literature in many countries contain data about the cultures and writers of Soviet autonomous republics — e. g. Bashkiria, Tataria, Komi and others — were previously completely "passed over" abroad. This is a significant process! It will certainly be continued.

The important thing to note here is that the literatures of the USSR peoples enter world literature as both Soviet and national, and the Soviet is inseparable from the national. The national character of socialist cultures must become a guarantee of the wealth and diversity of the spiritual life of future mankind, and its inexhaustible spiritual strength. This was foreseen several decades ago by the prominent Marxist aesthetician and one of the first and leading organizers of Soviet literature, A. Lunacharsky:

"Mankind is not to be stopped in his advance toward the internationalization of culture. The basis of culture will, of course, remain national for a long time, possibly forever, but internationalism does not envisage the deletion of national motifs, but their rich and free harmonious use in the general human symphony."

The Great Reality

Today, nobody can deny the great reality of socialism which but half a century ago was derogatively called a chimera.

However, even to this day reactionaries have not stopped their furious attacks on the ideas and reality of socialism, neither have they abandoned the hope of distorting its essence, of compromising it before history and in the eyes of the workers abroad. Even now, they are far from wanting in spreading insinuations and slander about, say, the real look of socialism's national politics and national culture, or about the CPSU's national policy and the practice of solving the national question in the USSR.

What is back of all this? First of all, it is doubtless the class refusal of the bourgeoisie, their ideologists and their nationalistic reserves to accept our reality. It is also due to the relevant conscious anti-socialist orientation of these circles, as well as of others whom they influence.

However, another important reason is the utter ignorance of our present-day reality by these local Philistines.

But what is even more important is the fact that these conceptions and understandings are ingrained in people abroad, fed as they are by bourgeois reality, by pre-socialist history and by experience which, to us, is completely alien; that these conceptions and understandings are being made absolute standards and are applied to the socialist way of life without any critical approach, arbitrarily and mechanically.

If our life is approached from the bourgeois standpoint, then a great part of it will be either incorrectly understood

or not understood at all. For example, whoever evaluates our national reality, the national-political situation of Soviet Ukraine by the dubious "ideals" of bourgeois statehood, will find many reasons to be disappointed. The same would be the case with whoever might judge our reality proceeding from the "ideal" of perpetuating national isolation, self-sufficiency, and egotism. Either approach, however, is behind the times by a whole historical epoch: the epoch of the Revolution and socialist construction, the socialist development of all the many peoples of the USSR, including the Ukrainian nation. They cannot nullify this epoch. No matter how much they try to impose other concepts and standards upon this epoch which, for our people, is already over — it will get them nowhere.

The Ukrainian people, together with all the other Soviet peoples, will never turn back, will never be dissuaded from their new ideas (in particular, their ideas about the *national* and the *international,* about the community of the people's basic interests, about the future of a union of mankind into a single communist family of nations), ideas which are deeply and irrevocably rooted in their minds.

Nobody has ever been able, nor will ever be able, to arbitrarily impose upon, or instil into, any society either a "worse" or a "better" outlook. Only those conceptions prevail in a society which are in conformity with its essence.

What all the bourgeois "critics" in a socialist society are still unable to realize is the fact that the political, moral, legal or other categories and notions reflecting the nature of our social life, are by no means "obliged" to correspond to the bourgeois world outlook, nor do they require its "sanction" for their existence. These categories are born of the content of our life and their scientific validity and practical usage are based on their conformity with the facts and needs of their life.

Soviet people can only laugh at those who speak today on behalf of bourgeois ideals, categories and conceptions which are alleged to be "perpetual" and "standard"; laugh at those who claim that nonconformity with these categories and conceptions is to be regarded as inadequacy, as a lack of realism and a sign of immaturity.

Marxist philosophy has long proven that the content of ideological and theoretical conceptions is determined in sociology by the historical content of social relations, and

that this determination is as inevitable as an irrevocable law.

The categories, concepts and general ideas of the Soviet way of life — particularly those of national life — reflect the social (including national) relations of this very life. This is the only way such concepts and ideas can be regarded. Another standpoint from which they can be approached is the future development of mankind. As regards any "checkups" relying upon past criteria, bourgeois criteria, they are good for nothing. The more so that these criteria, because of their class limitations and perversity, are incapable of containing the incomparably richer and more humane, the more directly wise and more socially healthy ideas and conceptions that make up Soviet life. The bourgeois consciousness, unless it takes these into account, invariably encounters misunderstanding, "annoyances" and lack of contact.

Our world of an entirely different reality with entirely different regularities and concepts, has been in existence for some sixty years and continues to develop today. This is the world of a multinational socialist society which is implementing the principles of national equality and equal participation by its nations in a universal historical process. This is a world which is united into one single whole and multiplies the nations' creative forces, summing up their historical and practical contribution to this process (the result of this summing-up belongs to all the socialist nations; each one feels that it is the subject of this joint action through its belonging to the Soviet people). Finally, this is a world which grants every nation a historical arena upon which to align all its creative forces.

The nature of this world substantiates the character of Soviet culture — a new, socialist culture.

Literature and the arts, culture as a whole, have always reflected, and still do, the nature and character of their society in every possible way. Our multinational culture mirrors the profound internationalism inherent to Soviet society. In every distinguished creation of literature and the arts—whatever the nationality of its brilliant author — we shall find the comprehension of our socialist history and of our socialist present-day life as a joint creation of all the USSR peoples, with a common heritage and wealth; we shall find there the spirit of self-respect and respect for

others, the spirit of amicability, brotherly coexistence and fraternal feelings for other peoples, the spirit of national and general-Soviet dignity.

The internationalism of Soviet literature, culture and the arts is not a notion that is stagnant, in the sense of full completion. It is continually in the process of maturing, deepening and improving. The general trend of this process leads to the development, enrichement and deepening or, in other words, to the flourishing of national cultures and their simultaneous rapprochement, fraternizing and expanding the sphere of what is common to all — alongside the further advancement of national cultures on a principally common basis. The dialectics of prosperity and rapprochement, the dialectics of the *special national* and the *general international* in socialist cultures (hence in the one single Soviet culture) opens a new page in the historical annals of world cultural and literary progress.

The Czech literary critic M. Zahradka made an accurate observation to this end:

"The process of the advancement of national literatures which are developing the progressive traditions of their respective nations is moving side by side with the process of the reciprocal enrichment and mutual permeation of elements of different nations, based on the unity of Soviet literature. This dialectical process of the simultaneous development of elements of different nations and uniting them into a single whole in socialist literature, forms an essentially new phenomenon in the history of world literature."

This new phenomenon, in fact, outlines the trend of the future progress of all literatures throughout the world. It is blazing a trail. It was no coincidence that one of the greatest of U.S. poets, Walter Lowenfalls, in his letter to Pablo Neruda where he summed up his speculations about the prospects of world literary life, expressed himself in categories born of the experience of our new, socialist world:

"We are moving toward a new culture, national in form, and international, humane and socialist in content."

The development of varied national cultures based on internationalism and on a uniform socialist ideology is, and remains, the foundation upon which rests the wealth and strength of all Soviet literature, culture and the arts.

In our society, literature and the arts, writers and artists enjoy the deep respect, trust and support of the Party and the entire people. Nowhere else but in the Soviet Union is the talent of an artist and creator, dedicated to the people's cause, so highly valued. "Talented works of literature and the arts are part of the national heritage," stressed General Secretary of the CC of the CPSU Leonid Brezhnev in his *Report to the 25th CPSU Congress.*

First Secretary of the CC of the Communist Party of Ukraine Volodymyr Shcherbitsky also spoke warmly and with pride about the successes of Ukrainian literature and the arts in his Report *On the Results of the 25th CPSU Congress and Tasks of Party Organizations of the Republic* to the Republican meeting of Party activists. He noted, in part, that "Ukraine's writers and men of the arts have created a number of works in recent years which have won wide public acclaim."

The socialist internationalization of national cultures has nothing in common with their "denationalization" and "unification," which would inevitably impoverish our socialist culture and would make it impossible to fulfill the tasks of communist cultural construction.

Vladimir Lenin more than once explained that international culture is not denationalized and that socialism does not unify but, on the contrary, diversifies man's cultural life to a great extent; he pointed out the fact that under socialism there will be a "downfall of national *partitions* (italicized by Lenin — **I. D.**) of every kind, this without decreasing but, on the contrary, increasing a millionfold the 'differentiation' of humanity, in the meaning of the wealth and the variety in spiritual life, ideological trends, tendencies, and shades."

The countinuously growing prosperity and progress of all national cultures in the Soviet Union is a great achievement of socialism and a multiplication of our common spiritual wealth. The continuity and deepening of this process is guaranteed by the whole national policy of the Party, by the very nature of Soviet multinational society, and by the very goal of communism.

It would be difficult to find better words that would sum up our discussion than those I borrowed from the *Report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 23rd Party Congress:*

"In the past few years, many works by gifted men of the arts from the Union republics have won fame in the Soviet Union and abroad. Each of our republics can boast of outstanding men of the arts and of splendid achievements in literature and the arts. The national and, consequently, exceedingly varied cultures of the peoples comprising the fraternal family of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics constitute one culture, single in its socialist content and imbued with the grand spirit of communist construction and common concern for the welfare and prosperity of one great multinational country."

* * *

CONTENTS

UKRAINIAN CULTURE AND ITS ILL-WISHERS 6
CULTURE AND THE NATIONAL QUESTION 9
FRIENDSHIP AND MUTUAL ASSISTANCE AMONG USSR NATIONS AS PRACTICAL MANIFESTATION OF SOCIALIST INTERNATIONALISM 18
SOVIET PEOPLE — A NEW HISTORICAL COMMUNITY . . 26
DIALECTICS OF THE FLOURISHING AND RAPPROCHEMENT OF NATIONS AND NATIONAL CULTURE 30
SOCIALIST IN CONTENT, NATIONAL IN FORM, INTERNATIONAL IN SPIRIT AND CHARACTER 35
THE UNITY AND DIVERSITY OF LITERATURE OF SOCIALIST REALISM 39
SOVIET MAN — MASTER OF ENORMOUS MULTINATIONAL CULTURAL WEALTH 47
SOCIALIST NATIONAL CULTURES: CHANNELS OF MUTUAL INFLUENCE AND WAYS OF INTERACTION 60
SOVIET UKRAINIAN CULTURE ON THE ROAD TO PROSPERITY 79
THROUGH THE EYES OF THE BIG WORLD 117
IN ONE UNITED FAMILY 105
THE GREAT REALITY 130

UKRAINA SOCIETY
KIEV, 1976